This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

MAY 15 1945
13

THE

UNITARIAN.

VOL. I. JANUARY, 1834. No. 1.

CONTENTS

The following volume The Unitarian, Vol. 1
was bound without missing issues 4, 6, 9
STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

CAMBRIDGE:
JAMES MUNROE AND COMPANY.
BOSTON:
RUSSELL, ODIORNE, AND METCALF.
1834.

Metcalf, Keyes, and Brown, Printers, Cambridge.

PROSPECTUS

OF

THE UNITARIAN.*

In proposing the publication of a new religious journal, it is proper to state, that the main purpose which we have in view is to furnish a work for THE PEOPLE.

THE UNITARIAN will be devoted, primarily, to the explanation and defence of the principles of UNITARIAN CHRISTIANITY. In pursuance of this object, we shall endeavour, not only to expose error and to present the truth, but to enforce a practical obedience to the truth. While, therefore, some of our articles are intended to be of a doctrinal kind, a just proportion will be of such as are designed to influence the life and character. Next, the subject of SUNDAY SCHOOLS, and, from its intimate connexion with the interests of virtue and pure religion, the subject of POPULAR EDUCATION also, will claim a prominent place. The operations of the principal RELIGIOUS and BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATIONS of the day, both foreign and domestic, will likewise be matter of constant attention. NOTICES of BOOKS, particularly those relating to religion and education, will be given; and those, with a special view to discriminate between such as may appear to be of a useful tendency and adapted to the popular wants, and the contrary. To these will be added a list of NEW PUBLICATIONS on the above-mentioned subjects, so far as may be practicable. Articles of INTELLIGENCE, as well foreign as domestic, having a bearing on the general objects of the work, will also be furnished.

On all topics which may come under our notice we shall aim to express our views with great freedom and plainness. We shall open our pages to proper articles on all questions within the plan of our work. The names of the several writers will generally be attached to their respective productions.

BERNARD WHITMAN, *Waltham, Mass.*
JASON WHITMAN, *Saco, Me.*
GEORGE NICHOLS, *Cambridge, Mass.*†

Conditions. — THE UNITARIAN will be issued in monthly numbers, by JAMES MUNROE & CO., *Cambridge, Mass.* Each number will contain on an average, 48 pages royal 12mo., [i. e. octavo size], and be printed on good paper, and with handsome type. The price will be two dollars per annum, payable on the first of March. To those who procure six subscribers, a seventh copy will be furnished *gratis*. The usual discount to Agents. All letters and communications to be addressed to the publishers.

---

* The name originally intended for this work was THE UNITARIAN OBSERVER. It has been since thought expedient, however, to drop the latter half, retaining only, for the title, the words, THE UNITARIAN.

† The name of Rev. A. P. Peabody, of Portsmouth, N. H., was originally given as one of the Editors of this work; but the increase of his professional duties, since the death of his late lamented colleague, dissolves upon him the necessity of withdrawing from the editorial office.

THE UNITARIAN.

VOL. I. JANUARY 1, 1834. No. 1.

THE UNITARIAN.

THE general objects of this work have been already set forth in the prospectus. And as its character will be better judged of by the manner in which it shall be conducted than by any prolix statement of our plan, we shall not trouble our readers with a lengthened preface.

One word, however, respecting the character of our doctrinal articles. In our own immediate vicinity, the discussion of such topics as the Trinity and the doctrines of Calvinism will perhaps appear like taking a step backwards into the region of by-gone controversy, and as being uncalled for by the prevailing state of religious opinions amongst us, now that Unitarianism has happily become so well established in our community. But it must be borne in mind that we are writing, not for our own community simply, but for the country at large, for sections upon which Unitarianism is but just now dawning. With those, then, to whose minds the argument on this subject has long been so familiar as to have now become almost stale, let this be our apology for reviving the argument and giving to it so large a space on our pages.

A word more, as to one other point — our title, THE UNITARIAN. It is objected, as we anticipated it would be, that it savours of sectarianism. We selected this title, — not indeed, we trust, in a sectarian spirit, that is, with the view of

I 75572 005 XL
85 53

exciting divisions and fostering animosities, nor yet to help a party-object, — but simply to show our colours. Unitarians are every day charged with concealing their sentiments, with the desire of smoothing over their peculiarities in religious opinion. Now in order to meet this charge, we want our work to go forth bearing on its front the principles we hold. And besides, — in an age when error is so rife, we conceive it to be all-important to follow closely in the steps of the Apostle, "*glorying* in the cross of Christ;" not "hiding the light under a bushel," but setting it forth "upon a candle-stick." In common with our brethren, we look longingly for peace; yet we must say we have no sympathy, we cannot sympathize, with those who, for the sake of peace, are willing to consent even to that dishonourable peace which yields the ground to a system of faith of whose corruptness and pernicious effects every day is witness. We feel that Unitarians owe a duty to their faith, a solemn, a weighty duty, — that this cause is the cause of God, of Christ, the hope of the world, — and that we have no right to shrink from it, even seemingly. Believing thus, we would avow this cause openly, unequivocally. If the consequence be war, we shall deplore it, but we cannot think the blame will be ours; even He who came to bring peace on earth brought first a sword. We shall therefore plainly declare what we solemnly believe to be the truth of the gospel; and we shall fearlessly expose what, guided by the principles of the gospel, we esteem error. We shall "speak the truth," — we trust it may never be otherwise than "in love." Believing those who differ from us to be no less sincere than ourselves, we shall ever be ready, while we deny their doctrines, to extend to the individuals themselves the right hand of christian fellowship and brotherhood. We believe that there is no necessary connexion between controversy touching matters of faith and that evil spirit of vituperation which would make deadly foes of all who differ from one another; and we trust, that by God's grace, we by our practice may demonstrate it.

Meantime, we commend our journal to the favour of the public, hoping for indulgence to its faults, and praying God that it may be made an instrument of good in our hands, — in its humble sphere, a light to the church, a herald of the gospel as it is in Christ Jesus, — a means of redemption to many from the sad gloom of false views of religion, on the one hand, — from the fearful, and, as it would seem, the wide-yawning gulf of infidelity, on the other.

THE EDITORS.

A Letter to the Editors, on the Religious Condition and Wants of the Community, etc.

PERMIT me to express to you, Messrs. Editors, the satisfaction I have received from the prospectus of THE UNITARIAN. Believing, as I do so firmly, that the truths we hold as the gospel of Jesus Christ are most intimately connected with the dearest interests of man, that they are truths eminently calculated to elevate and refine his character, to develope and strengthen whatever is pure and generous and excellent in his nature, to free him from sin and the power of all debasing influences, and to make him what he should be, what he was most obviously designed to be, — like his Creator, — and, by their influence on the individual character, to nourish whatever is lovely in social and domestic life, and send abroad through society the vigorous and healthy streams of integrity, benevolence, and piety, I cannot but rejoice that a publication, of the character you propose, is forthcoming, and I trust that, by the blessing of God, it will be as successful as it is necessary.

Although your work will be mainly devoted to the explanation and defence of Unitarianism, I readily believe, what you would wish to be inferred from the prospectus, that its character will not be sectarian.* In advocating the cause of Unitarianism, you present the claims of *Christianity*. You will send your

* I wish that, some time or other, you would give the public an article on Sectarianism, and explain the meaning of the term, which I fear is but little understood.

work among "the people," not that, appealing to their prejudices and antipathies, you may gather them into the circle of a sect, — the ignoble aim of a narrow and intolerant mind, but that you may give to every man, whom your words may reach, wider and more persuasive views of the great objects of his existence, of his relations and duty to God, and of his final destiny. It is necessary, indeed, that you should be employed in controversy — an irksome labour at all times; but if, with these great objects in view, you go on, with that noble spirit of honesty, generosity, and candour, so proper for those who would recommend the religion of Jesus, I doubt not that you will be eminently successful.

It would be presumptuous in me to assume the office of an adviser; but I hope you will not censure me if I make a few remarks, which a limited observation has taught me are not unimportant. Perhaps they have occurred to your own minds. From the two extreme quarters of the christian community the cry has repeatedly been heard, that Unitarians are not sufficiently explicit in the declaration of all their opinions—that they either withhold such a declaration, through timidity or an unworthy policy, or obscure their views by vague explanations. This presumptuous charge has been built upon the fact, that Unitarians, as a body, have not met the demands of their brethren to lay before the community any general creed or formulary of faith, that they have been reasonably unwilling to declare that certain sentiments belong to the faith of the whole class, which are professed only by a few individuals, from the fact that on minor points they differ considerably among themselves, and finally, from the fact that they are unwilling to adopt as their own all the unfounded inferences which others have been pleased to draw from their opinions. But however unfounded, the accusation has not been without its influence. In some minds, warped by a calumny so extensively circulated, there is a strong prejudice against us on this ground. This prejudice you can do much to remove by your example. I wish only to draw your attention forcibly to this point, when I say, Be *honest* — there is every thing in that word. You will not think me so simple or so utterly uncivil as to advise you to speak the truth. What I mean is, that the strongest and fullest *expression* of honesty in its highest sense should appear on your pages. Be open-minded, fearless. Let no one read a number of your work without feeling that he may rely on you with the utmost confidence — that you will never cover up difficulties, if such you know to exist, that you will

always distinctly state what you mean, and that you will never fear to declare whatever doctrine you believe to have been taught by Jesus Christ.

It has sometimes been said, that Unitarians speak of their opinions with diffidence, distrust, uncertainty. That they sometimes speak with *diffidence* on controverted points is true. But whether this has not been dictated by modesty is not for me to say. At least, this would be the most charitable inference. It is possible that the language they have frequently used may not have conveyed that strength of conviction which they intended to express, and thus laid the foundation for the charge to which I have alluded. It is better, however, to err in this way, than to assume that bold and arrogant tone with which presumptuous polemics would fain overawe the multitude and annihilate all opposition. May THE UNITARIAN be entirely free from dogmatism and presumption. May it be characterized by a spirit of true charity. But, at the same time, let it assume the position which a manly and convinced mind will take without arrogance, that you are exhibiting the claims of *Christianity*. Let it be felt that you are not apologists for a set of novel opinions, but that the truths you teach are those which Jesus Christ announced, for which he died, and which are of unspeakable value to man. There is a wide difference between dogmatism and a modest confidence. The voice of truth is ever lofty and commanding; the tones of error, though venerable in its years, are only insolent and haughty.

As this is nothing more than a familiar epistle, you will not censure me for a want of method. I rejoice that your work will be written for *the people* — that it is designed for all classes of our community.

To one of these classes I would direct your attention. In not a few of our country towns where Unitarianism has not yet gone, there are many individuals, the general tenor of whose lives is very commendable; they are good neighbours and good citizens; much respected for their integrity, and exert a beneficial influence throughout the sphere in which they live. But they make no pretensions to religion, attend church very infrequently, and would not loudly complain, perhaps, if its doors were closed. They do not utterly reject Christianity. The force of education is sufficiently strong to prevent such a consummation. They are not willing to be called skeptics or unbelievers; still, they have no fixed reli-

gious opinions. The notion is deeply imbedded in their minds that the doctrines of Calvinism are Christianity itself; and so great are the prejudices of education, and so strong the associations of custom, that they are unable to conceive how any other interpretation, than that which they have always heard, should be put on the passages of Scripture which have been supposed to declare those doctrines. Hence, being men of plain, common sense, who usually take the most direct way to their conclusions, they practically reject the gospel. They tell you that it can do them no good, and that it is absurd. On these points they frequently argue with great shrewdness and force. They tell you that the doctrines of Christianity are at war with the suggestions of that reason which God has given us for the conduct of life. And they likewise urge that many, if not the most, of those who have been converted and are under the full influence of religion are worse citizens and neighbours than they were before, — that they are more presumptuous, dogmatical, and exclusive, and less modest, candid, and benevolent, — that they are more crafty and calumnious, and less generous and open-hearted, — that while they bestow largely of their substance for distant objects of charity, they are less attentive to the wants of their neighbours and the good of the community in which they live. I am not asserting that these men are always candid, that they always reason well, nor that prejudice may not have much to do with their inferences. Still, confounding, as they almost unavoidably do, error with truth, the corruptions of Christianity with its simple doctrines, it is not unnatural that they should be anxious to remove themselves as far as possible from the sphere of its influence. Following these is another class, who have the same general views of Christianity, but whose conduct is not so estimable, and who, of course, are more beyond the reach of religious instruction. The great object is to revive and quicken these men; to awaken the spirit of inquiry among them; to direct their search after truth, and to teach them what is truth; to make them feel that there is such a thing as true religion, however there may have been many counterfeits in the world; that it is necessary to their well-being, and that man was made to be religious; to teach them the nature of Christianity, and that it contains the noblest truths, suited to their faculties and condition as rational and moral beings, and to their wants as sinners; to teach them their relations and duty to God, and the great objects of life. The influence which this class of our citizens exerts is very con-

siderable. I hope that you will regard them with especial interest. You need expect but little interference here. Those of our Orthodox brethren who are at all acquainted with the case, know as well as I do that their teaching cannot influence these men. It cannot reach them. They will not hear it. Should your journal fortunately go among them, you may do much, simply by showing them that Christianity is Unitarianism, — by exhibiting to them truths, which, while they are a revelation from God, are, at the same time, coïncident with principles which reason has adopted. My faith is strong that Unitarianism is the power of God unto salvation, and I devoutly hope that you will be an instrument in conveying its simple truths to those who are beyond the reach of any other influence.

The present aspect of the world, in a religious point of view, is interesting and impressive. Old authority is gone. The influence of prescription is gone. The human mind is passing from blind obedience to rules and dogmas, for which it could give no better reasons than the assertions of its teachers, to a condition in which its convictions of truth shall be established on the basis of its own independent investigations. It is gradually feeling its way to something surer and better. In such a state of things, which, in all probability, will long continue, it becomes us to observe the many and conflicting elements which are at work in society. Generally speaking, it may be said that most civilized communities are awakened to the value of religious truth — that truth which concerns the highest interests of man and his immortal destiny. The convictions of its reality and importance are striking deeper and deeper. The mind is anxious, and intent on the great question, What is truth? It has thrown off the shackles of authority and asserted its right to investigate truth for itself. But, so long has it been confined, its limbs are enfeebled and its sight has grown dim. In that restless and feverish state, the consequence of emancipation, it is eager to hurry on. But it is impeded by many causes. It has not yet cut off its old associations. It is still influenced by fear, and error is yet venerable. And what is more, it has hardly discerned the sources of truth. It eagerly asks, What is truth? but has not yet determined where it is nor how it is to be found. There is heard the discord of a thousand voices. All would be taught, but all would be teachers. An uninterrupted conflict is going on between hope and the conscious-

ness of freedom and an earnest looking for truth, on the one hand, and on the other, a feeling of amazement at the magnitude of the objects which open before the mind, united with fear, anxiety, and doubt, and the remains of superstition and dogmatism, and the strong associations which still cling around old errors. We rejoice at the emancipation of the mind. But few of us consider, as we ought, the evils which are the necessary consequence of its throwing off the shackles of a prescribed faith. While preceding ages were endeavouring to govern its growth by dogmas and creeds of their own devising, they cast no prophetic glance to that point in the future when it would burst those envelopements and pursue its own way. For such an event, consequently, they made no preparation, either by teaching the importance of truth, or supplying the mind with principles for its search. And now that time has come, and we see the result. Large masses of society not only have no settled religious opinions, but they hardly know the sources of truth, and are at a loss from what point to begin or how to pursue their investigations. The mind, I repeat, has cut itself away from a prescribed faith, and hopefully launched forth on the wide sea of speculation. But without compass or star to guide its way, amazed and anxious, and often looking back to the untroubled waters it has left, it is hurried on by the winds of expectation, and driven back by fear, or swept by the eddying gusts of novel theories; or, despairing to reach the coast whose shadowy line it dimly discerns in the distance, it suffers itself to be borne swiftly along the smooth, deceitful current of unbelief.

Such is one feature in the present condition of the religious world. But I would confine these remarks to our own community. I have no disposition to detract from the noble and well earned fame of our ancestors. Still, it is not wonderful that sometimes they should have erred. Until recent times, nearly all the religious instruction received by the people at large was communicated by the pulpit. Its tones were always authoritative. The clergy announced doctrines which they knew would not be disputed. Their style of preaching, with a very few exceptions, was unvaried. They constantly used a set of phrases, for the most part undefined, which were supposed to contain the fundamental points of an orthodox faith. They recommended the reading of the Scriptures, as a means of edification and general instruction, but did not foster a spirit of inquiry, and gave their hearers no principles of

interpretation, no guides for the pursuit of truth. The mind was at last awakened to religious investigations, and the general interest in such pursuits has been increasing ever since.

We may now observe the results of the former state of things; and they will best be seen by an example. If you go into one of our villages where the spirit of inquiry has not long existed to any considerable extent, you will find those who still cling to the Orthodox views in which they were educated, but who can give few reasons for the faith that is in them, and when pressed by difficulties are unable to meet them; a few, holding the same opinions, whose faith rests on a surer basis; a few, also, and but a few, who have worked their way to better views; and then, a class more numerous than all the others, who may be said to have no religious views, or next to none; and, finally, some who do not spurn the name of Deist. If I may judge from what I have seen and heard, this illustration will apply to many of our towns in the interior. In other places, where the spirit of inquiry has existed longer, there is, of course, more rational conviction on religious subjects. Still, wherever you go, you will find too many who have no settled opinions, whose notions of the nature of religion are vague and indistinct, who need to be told not so much what is true as how to acquire it, and who want the right principles of interpreting the Scriptures. Those among them who are true inquirers are often perplexed, anxious, and fearful. They would receive the truth with gladness, they would pursue it earnestly; but they need to be guided by those lights which those have found who are now before them. The errors which they have been wont to respect are yet venerable. The force of education is still strong. They are afraid of something, they hardly know what — afraid, perhaps, that some inauspicious breeze may strand their frail bark on the barrenness of infidelity. They need, therefore, to be encouraged. They need to be told that the very highest reverence for God and truth demands that they modestly, but fearlessly, pursue their inquiries, — that they reject every doctrine, however dear or venerable, which is not sanctioned by revelation, and receive without hesitation whatever they believe God has declared, be the anticipated consequences what they may.

I doubt not that your journal will direct its efforts to these important objects, and I pray God that it may be successful.

I have extended this letter to an unreasonable length, and will conclude by again expressing my satisfaction at the appearance of your prospectus.

Yours, very sincerely,

A Unitarian.

Cambridge, Dec. 3, 1833.

A Holy Life the most Persuasive Argument.

For a short time after the ascension of Christ, God wrought with his apostles by signs and wonders; but the arm of power was soon drawn back into heaven, and the work of propagating the gospel was then left to human charity. Now there is nothing that tends so much to retard the progress of the christian religion as the unholy lives of its professors; on the other hand, there is nothing so well adapted to aid its propagation as the holy lives and conversation of its professors. To show this, we have only to glance at the history and present state of the christian church.

The conversation of the apostles was worthy of the gospel. They were blameless in the sight of enemies as well as of friends. Malice itself could find no charge against them, except that they were defenders of a faith every where spoken against. Their first disciples were imitators of them. "See how these Christians love one another!" was the remark even of the Pagans concerning them. In an accusation brought against the early Christians by the celebrated Pliny, he states that it was a part of their regular religious service to bind themselves by an oath to lead pure and honest lives. While this was the character of the christian church, it grew in spite of the rage of the persecutor. The blood of its martyrs was a seed from which sprang a most abundant harvest. The purity with which the Christians lived, the fortitude with which they suffered, the triumphant hope with which they died, called forth the admiration of their enemies, and often changed them from enemies to friends. The very men who bound the martyr to the stake

often left it Christians. The name of Jesus was, ere long, preached throughout the then known world. Christianity soon mounted the throne of the Cæsars. But its elevation was a curse to its prosperity. Its ministers, when they put on purple and scarlet, dropped the garment of righteousness; and, when they began to fare sumptuously in kings' palaces, they forgot the example of the meek and lowly Jesus. Corruption and spiritual death brooded over the church; and then its borders ceased to be enlarged, except by the power of the sword. There was then nothing to draw unbelievers into its fold. The conduct of Christians was no better, and hence there was no reason to suppose their faith any better, than that of the surrounding heathen. And from that time to the date of the Reformation, hardly any accessions, except by force, were made from Paganism to Christianity. Since the Reformation, the moral character of Christendom has been constantly improving; and the prospects of the missionary enterprise have been in the same proportion constantly brightening.

But now, what is the greatest obstacle to the christianizing of the world? It is the unchristian conduct of those who call themselves, or are called, Christians. Our North American Indian will point to his white neighbours, and say: "These are the men who first taught us the vice, and who give us the means, of intoxication. These are the men who cheat us and lie to us, and teach us to cheat and lie. They call themselves Christians, and want us to be Christians too. But our religion never taught us to take advantage of each other's ignorance, or to take by violence or fraud the property of those at peace with us. Our great Spirit approves not of such deeds nor of those who practise them, nor will He permit his children to embrace your religion." The Hindoo will point to the European or American sailors, and say: "These are your Christians — men who blush not to wallow in vices which we abhor even to name. Better that a few devotees should crush themselves beneath Juggernaut's car, better that a few widows should fall victims to their nuptial vows, than that our people should be stained with such crimes as these christian sailors commit." The African will point with a tearful eye and an aching heart to the slave-ship, as she leaves his shore. "There were men here," he will say, "not long since, who tried to persuade us to become Christians. That cursed ship was manned by Christians. The religion of our fathers did not teach them

to send their prisoners of war into bondage in a strange land. These Christians taught us this lesson. It is Christians who send their ships across the deep hither, to lade them with the living spoils of war and treachery. We want not the religion of such men; our own is better." And to those heathen who are so situated as to behold the internal state of the christian church, what a picture must it present! "How can they," might an intelligent heathen justly say, "how can these Christians call theirs a religion of peace and love? Is it not rather one of strife and dissension, of pride and vain-glorying? When we go up to worship, we reach forth the hand to every fellow-worshipper, and should disdain to feast upon a sacrifice of strife. But these men quarrel, and rail at each other, and abuse each other, even in the temple of their God. Let us keep peace among ourselves, and not endanger it by changing our religion."

Such are the wounds which Christ receives in the house of his professed friends. His avowed enemies have done his cause comparatively little harm. That cause can never flourish, till those who call themselves his friends are his friends indeed, and show themselves such by keeping his commandments. The word of God gives us reason to expect the universal supremacy of Christianity. But before that can take place, there must be a revival of pure and undefiled religion throughout Christendom, — all the inhabitants of christian countries must exhibit such a conversation as becometh the gospel; and then the gospel will have free course and be glorified. Then every ambassador, every traveller, every sailor, will be a missionary of the cross. Those who now sit in darkness will not be long in learning that justice and truth and mercy govern the hearts and lives of all who dwell in christian lands, and they too will court the beams of the Sun of righteousness. But this moral renovation in Christendom is to be produced by individual effort, by individual holiness. Let every one live as the gospel requires, and he does vastly more towards the diffusion of the gospel, than he could otherwise do, by bestowing upon benevolent objects all his time, or the whole of his property, however large.

We have seen how Paganism has thriven through the unholiness of Christians. We remark, further, that modern infidelity is a viper born and nourished in the very bosom of the christian church. The period when infidelity prevailed most in England was a time when the clergy of the estab-

lished church were indolent, dissipated, utterly careless of the souls under their charge; when the dissenting ministers were zealous, indeed, but intolerant in their zeal, and ready to commit murder and almost every other crime in the name of the Lord. We all know how completely infidelity deluged France toward the close of the last century. The priests were banished or guillotined, the churches closed, the sabbath voted out of existence by the great assembly of the nation, and prayers offered and hymns sung to the statue of liberty, in mockery of the supreme Divinity, while rivers of blood rolled down the streets of Paris at the bidding of men who literally trampled upon the cross. And all this sin was chargeable upon nominal Christians. It was the unholiness, the corruption of Christians, that made the most learned and influential men of France infidels. For many ages piety had been a rare gift among the more prominent of the French clergy. Many of them had lived in the open indulgence of the most degrading vices, had wasted, at court, at the theatre, and in riotous living, money extorted from the necessities of the people, and had evinced as little practical belief in God, heaven, and spiritual things, as if life had been a dream, the judgment a bug-bear, God and Christ fictitious personages. And the people had too willingly followed the example of their spiritual guides. They had gone statedly to the sanctuary, had heard a religious service in an unknown tongue, had partaken of the consecrated bread, and then had gone back to the world to mingle in its dissipation and its knavery, without knowing a single principle of the gospel to restrain them from iniquity. The unholy lives of its professors led thinking men to doubt, and ultimately to deny, the divine origin of Christianity. They thought the credentials of a system, which had such unworthy professors, not even worth examining; and they therefore rejected the gospel without examination. A system, which numbered among its guardians, among its priests, the friends of all manner of iniquity, they thought deserving of the most violent opposition; and they therefore strove to subvert Christianity. They succeeded, and, for a short time, made this fickle nation a nation of infidels.

In our own country the friends of infidelity have, within a very few years, made great efforts, and have met with much success. And the faults of Christians have been the chief weapons of their warfare. We have examined several numbers of a weekly paper published in Boston, devoted to infi-

delity, and have found them filled, not with arguments against the Scriptures, not with reproaches upon Christ's character, not with attempts to show any defect in the gospel system of morals; but with instances of the foolish or wicked conduct of professing Christians, with cases of fraud, or knavery, or hard-heartedness among zealous church-members, and especially with instances of religious intolerance and uncharitableness. If all professing Christians in this country had led as holy lives as our pilgrim ancestors did, we do not believe that there would be, at the present time, a dozen infidels in the land. And now, if all those, who have named the name of Christ, would be careful to adorn their profession by holy lives, if they would all love each other as brethren, and, forgetting unessential differences, unite hand and heart against their common enemies, unbelief and sin, the infidel army would be at once disbanded, infidelity would flit away like the morning mist before the brightening beams of the sun, and God's name would be hallowed by those who now blaspheme it. We may all of us, then, by recommending our religion by holy lives, aid in checking the progress of infidelity more effectually than by arguing against it ourselves or by circulating the arguments of others. A holy life is the best defence of our religion, the best apology for its claims, the best evidence of its divinity.

There are yet others besides Pagans and infidels, upon whom Christians ought to exercise a salutary influence. We refer to those who, while they profess to be Christians, so far as belief is concerned, have never professed to act under the influence of christian motives or to cherish christian hopes. When such men are urged to form religious characters, they frequently point to professors of religion and say, "What do these men more than others? They are as ready as other people to overreach in bargains, and to coin and circulate slanderous reports. They are no better husbands, fathers, neighbours, nor citizens than we are. They show as much love for the world, its pleasures, and its gains as we do; and to those sins with which they are chargeable in common perhaps with ourselves, they add the still greater sin of hypocrisy, since they profess to be better than they are, while we profess only to be what we actually are." Thus, and if not with perfect justice, yet not without ground, men of the world, in excusing themselves for the neglect of religious duty, often characterize professors of religion. But if those who have named the name of Christ were careful to depart from all

iniquity, if they maintained characters so pure that malice itself could find no fault with them, then the irreligious would witness the divine power of the gospel, would perceive and confess that it is not without efficacy, would regard with admiration a religion which preserves its disciples from sin. Were there a revival of pure religion and practical piety throughout all the churches in our land, there would be a revival of the same among people of every class and order, multitudes would devote themselves to God, and vicious indulgence would soon lose its votaries. Counsels, entreaties, will avail but little with the thoughtless and the vicious, unless backed by a holy life. As, then, we value the undying souls of those around us, as we believe that the salvation of those souls depends upon their receiving and obeying the gospel, let our conversation be as becometh the gospel.

Among the different denominations of Christians also, holiness of life goes much farther than soundness of faith in advancing the interests of any particular sect. Sects that have advocated very strange and irrational systems of faith have often grown numerous and powerful through the piety of their members. The Quakers have a mystical system of belief which it would, doubtless, puzzle many to understand. Yet, when they first appeared, they spread very fast, on account of their strict honesty, their unsullied purity, their works of charity, their love of peace, and the meekness with which they bore persecution. The Swedenborgians have a a system so obscure and complicated that it is the labour of a life to understand it thoroughly, and so irrational as to attach to every sentence in the Bible three distinct significations. Yet they are making converts through the influence of their brotherly love, their heavenly-mindedness, their peaceful lives and charitable deeds.

Reader, are you a Unitarian? you have embraced what you regard, not as an obscure and unreasonable, but as a definite, rational, and scriptural system of faith, to which many of your fellow-Christians are warmly opposed. Their opposition to you is sincere, conscientious. They honestly fear that your doctrine is not according to godliness, — that it will not bring forth the fruits of the Spirit. Upon many of them argument will have no effect, for their fears will make them deaf to argument. But the eloquence of a holy life may win them. You believe that your system is preëminently adapted to form pure and holy characters. Show, then, the superior value of your faith by your works. Be tolerant even to the

intolerant, liberal to the illiberal, charitable to the uncharitable. Be faithful to every religious, every social, every personal duty. Keep the will of God constantly before you as your rule of action. Be not disheartened, though opposition hold out long, and still seem as violent as ever; for, by persevering in a good course, if you win not the favour of man, you at least gain that of God. And in time, those who now oppose you may be brought, if not to believe with you, at least to hold fellowship with you. And then you will have the satisfaction of having overcome their enmity, without having employed a single unchristian art or weapon. Such victories have been won. We have known instances in which deep-rooted prejudice has been in this way overcome. We have one such instance yet recent in our memory. A Calvinistic clergyman from a distance was invited to settle in a town where there were several religious societies, and, among others, one of the class commonly called Unitarian. Having never been acquainted with any of this denomination before, this clergyman took the right way of learning their character, not by catechizing them, but by inspecting their conduct. He saw a pastor and people living in peace among themselves and with all around them, devoted to the public worship of God and the ordinances of the gospel, bringing up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, engaged in forwarding every charitable enterprise, giving freely of their substance and their labour, wherever it was needed for the relief of the poor, the instruction of the ignorant, and the building up of Christ's kingdom, and leading lives, almost without exception, so irreproachable that calumny itself could find no fault with them. His mind was open to conviction; and he was candid enough to express the conviction forced upon his mind. After a few weeks' residence in the place, he said: "Before I came here, I was so presumptuous as to deny to Unitarians the christian name. I now rejoice to find among the sincere disciples and friends of Christ those whom, hitherto, I have accounted his enemies. And let me learn from this henceforth to suspend my judgment with respect to my brethren, till I can know them by their fruits." Would that instances of this kind were more frequent, that men would always judge the tree to be good when they find the fruit good! But make the tree good, and make the fruit good, and, if you gain not, you at least deserve, the esteem of all your fellow-Christians. Oh that the time might come, when, among the different portions of the christian church, the only strife shall be, which

shall abound the most in brotherly love and in good works, which shall exhibit a conversation the best becoming the gospel! Then, and not till then, will the church be truly prosperous. Then, and not till then, will God and Christ regard it with unmingled approbation.

A. P. Peabody.

Letters to Trinitarians and Calvinists.

No. I.

THE TRINITY.

Christian Brethren,

You well know that Unitarian Christians are every where spoken against. You know there are individuals, in almost every place, who are constantly casting reproach upon our sentiments and character. Permit me to ask you, whether there is anything in our peculiar views of religion deserving this unceasing and universal condemnation? In order to answer this question satisfactorily, you should be thoroughly acquainted with our distinguishing articles of belief. You should also possess an intimate and correct knowledge of the external and internal history of our denomination. I would therefore solicit your patient and candid attention to a brief exposition and defence of Unitarian Christianity.

I am induced to make this request for two very substantial reasons. In the first place, I enter upon this undertaking for your special benefit. Suppose one of your worthy neighbours had been accused of falsehood. Suppose you sincerely believed the report. Should you not feel unhappy? Would not your confidence in his integrity be destroyed? But if you could soon obtain satisfactory evidence that the charge was false, should you not greatly rejoice? Would not your esteem return and your friendship be renewed? Now some of the leading men of your church have denounced Unitarians as heretics, unbelievers, and wilful deceivers. You probably believe that their accusations are well founded. We solemnly aver, that our motives, opin-

ions, and actions are misrepresented. We claim the right of self-defence. Are you not willing to hear our arguments? Should you not rejoice to learn that we are honest aud innocent, and still deserving your confidence and fellowship? Listen, then, to our statements.

In the second place, I have undertaken this work for our own particular advantage. Suppose you had been charged with the crime of murder. Suppose you were conscious of being altogether innocent. Would you not desire an opportunity to prove the accusation to be false? Now some individuals of your sect have pronounced Unitarians to be worse than the heathen. We feel this to be a very serious charge. We suppose it is believed by some whose love we are anxious to retain. We know the accusation to be unjust. We therefore demand the privilege of answering in our own behalf. We are confident that we can present testimony which will satisfy every candid person of our integrity and innocence, and of the justice of our claims to the appellation of disciples of Christ. If, then, you would do unto others in all things as you would have others do unto you, you will assuredly give a patient hearing to our expositions and arguments.

Before I proceed to the main questions at issue, you will permit me to make two preliminary observations. And first, I wish it to be distinctly understood that I speak, in this and in all future communications, in my own name. I do not claim to be the organ of any sect or party. I go to no man or body of men to ascertain what I must believe or publish. As an individual, I shall give utterance to my honest convictions, and hold myself responsible for all my statements. I shall endeavour to present a distinct outline of my religious sentiments, and to state some of the reasons on which they are founded. I do not expect, however, to differ materially from the great body of Unitarian Christians in this country.

I wish it also to be distinctly understood, that I have no intention of denouncing either the motives or sentiments or characters of any class of believers. I cherish none but the most friendly and charitable feelings towards Christians of every name. I shall not return railing for railing, but, contrariwise, blessing. But I must be permitted to mention distinctly the doctrines which I reject as erroneous, and to give you some of the honest reasons for my rejection of what you deem sacred truth. I may also have occasion to allude to

the unchristian temper and conduct of some of our professing brethren, and to show their want of conformity with the spirit and example of our common Saviour. This, the only independent, christian course, I am sure every generous and noble mind must wish me to pursue, while I hold myself ready to correct all mistakes, and to publish all candid objections to my views and reasonings.

Permit me now, christian brethren, solemnly to affirm, that, in common with all other Christians, we firmly believe in the existence and providence of One eternal, all-perfect, all-pervading Spirit, the Creator, the Preserver, the Benefactor, and the Father of the universe. With all other Christians, we believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of the living God. With all other Christians, we believe that the Bible contains the faithful record of a special revelation from the infinite Jehovah. With all protestant Christians, we believe that the sacred Scriptures are a safe and sufficient guide of faith and practice, and that all persons have an equal and perfect right, nay, that it is their bounden duty, to interpret them for themselves. With all consistent Protestants, we believe that we are answerable to no man, to no body of men, to no church, to no council, for our religious opinions and observances; but only to our God, our Saviour, and our own consciences. With all consistent Protestants, we believe that the same principles of interpretation are to be applied to the holy writings which we apply to the contents of other books of equal antiquity and obscurity. Renouncing all allegiance to earthly masters, laying aside all human creeds and formularies of faith, acting in strict compliance with the fundamental principles of Protestantism, we make the Bible, and the Bible alone, the infallible standard of christian truth and holiness. By an honest and prayerful and persevering examination of its pages, we discover sentiments which other believers reject, and we are unable to find some doctrines which others receive. It is our great reverence for the Scriptures, our firm adherence to their plain and explicit instructions, our determination to obey God rather than men, our desire of proving all things and holding fast that only which is good, which compels us to dissent from the conclusions of some of our fellow-disciples. The most important points of difference I will now proceed to mention and illustrate.

I. We differ from some of our christian brethren in relation to *the nature of God.* They believe in what is called the doctrine of the Trinity. They believe, according to the

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

ings can never make one perfect Being; if they could, deities without number might be formed from the hosts of created intelligences with which the universe is filled. If you affirm that the Father is not a distinct *person*, that the Son is not a distinct *person*, that the Spirit is not a distinct *person*, but that Father, Son, and Spirit are merely different names for *distinctions* in the Deity; then you give up your belief in a trinity of persons; you believe in one God, while you mystify your doctrine with unintelligible terms. Now if you will candidly examine all the ideas which you have in your minds upon this subject, without any regard to sects or creeds, I think you will arrive at one of these three conclusions: — Either that you are endeavouring to believe in three perfect Beings, and, consequently, in three Gods, which is an absurdity; or that you are endeavouring to believe in three imperfect Beings, and, consequently, in no God, which is also an absurdity; or that you do actually believe in One all-perfect, all-pervading Spirit, the only true God, which is the fundamental article of the Unitarian creed. Let me, then, ask you to investigate this point with candour, so as to ascertain if our views do not perfectly coïncide on this important question.

2. In the second place, I reject the doctrine of the Trinity, because I can find no trace of it in the Old Testament. A triune God is nowhere spoken of, and there is not a text which intimates it. It is nowhere said, and it is nowhere hinted, that there are three persons or three distinctions of any sort in the Godhead. I have read every chapter and every verse of these ancient writings, and I have never discovered one text which contains such an idea. I have never seen the slightest allusion to any such doctrine from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Malachi. I have repeatedly asked those who belong to your church to mention a single passage in the Hebrew Scriptures which either teaches or implies such a sentiment. My request has never been granted. I believe most firmly that no individual can show any such text. Now if the Trinity is revealed in these sacred books, would it not have been discovered before this period of the world? As it never has been found in their pages, is it not fair to conclude that it is not contained therein? What, then, must be our conclusion? Would the all-wise God have called a people from idolatry, would he have made them the medium of communication to other

nations, would he have given them a special revelation of his will, would he have done all this, and not so much as have disclosed his true nature in one single instance? This seems to me impossible: and as he has nowhere given them the least hint of a trinity of persons in his Godhead, this silence is conclusive evidence to my mind of the human origin of the doctrine. But I will not decide for others. I only beseech you to search prayerfully the holy records: if you find the idea of three persons or distinctions anywhere on their pages, have the goodness to send me the chapter and verse: if you should not make any such discovery, have the independence and honesty to acknowledge publicly that no trace of the Trinity can be found in the Old Testament.

3. In the third place, I reject the doctrine of the Trinity, because I never heard of its being believed by an individual of the Jewish nation. This people were peculiarly favoured by the Most High. They were entrusted with many important and divine truths. Their lawgiver, their prophets, their wise men, wrote the several books which constitute the Old Testament. These sacred writings were designed for the special benefit of their countrymen. Now can you mention the name of one Jew, from the time of Abraham to the present day, who believed that God exists in three persons or distinctions? I think not. How, then, will you account for this remarkable fact? Will you contend that the very writers and readers of the Hebrew Scriptures mistook their true meaning on the fundamental article of all religion? To my mind this supposition appears utterly inadmissible. I cannot believe the all-wise Jehovah would have permitted his benevolent designs to have been thus frustrated. I cannot admit that such ignorance on the part of the people is possible. I must, therefore, conclude that no such doctrine was ever revealed to them. I can discover no trace of it in their sacred writings, and I can hear of no individual of their whole number who ever made such a discovery. This objection is to my mind truly unanswerable. I have never seen even a plausible explanation of this insurmountable difficulty. But I would have you decide this question for yourselves. Make diligent inquiry into the religious views of the ancient church. If you can find a Trinitarian among its various members, from the period of their election to receive the knowledge of the true God to the present day, please to forward his name. If you cannot succeed in this undertak-

ing, have the independence to acknowledge the fact, and the courage to admit the necessary consequence, that no such doctrine as the Trinity is contained in their Scriptures.

4. In the fourth place, I reject the doctrine of the Trinity, because I can find no trace of it in the New Testament. The blessed Jesus was educated in the Jewish religion, and in the sentiments of his ancestors. At his baptism, he received the holy Spirit without measure. He was commissioned to make a further revelation of the will of Jehovah, who had spoken to his fathers by the prophets, but who had in no instance spoken to them of a trinity of persons or distinctions in the Godhead. Did the Saviour preach this doctrine to his disciples? Did the apostles proclaim it to the world? Did they record it in their writings? I have carefully examined every sentence of the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles, and the book of Revelation, and I have never been able to discover even one text which contains the idea that God exists in three persons or distinctions. I have repeatedly asked members of your church to mention a single passage which explicitly teaches the doctrine. No one has ever complied with my request. I do not believe any one ever can. — I think the evidence is perfectly conclusive that the apostles did not consider Jesus as belonging to the Godhead. For when he was apprehended, tried, and crucified, they all forsook him and fled; one denied him with cursing and swearing, and another betrayed his innocent blood for thirty pieces of silver. Could they have been guilty of such conduct, had they believed he was the very God? Impossible. Had the doctrine been revealed to them after the resurrection, would they not have explicitly declared it in their discourses and mentioned it in their letters? This they have not done, and, to my mind, this silence presents an unanswerable objection to the doctrine. But I would have you search the Scriptures for yourselves. Whenever you find a passage which expresses the idea of three persons or distinctions in God, please to forward it. If you can discover none of this description, I trust you will have the independence to declare your honest convictions.

5. In the fifth place, I reject the doctrine of the Trinity, because I can trace it, most satisfactorily, to a human origin. I have examined the early history of the christian church with considerable attention. I have not room to introduce extracts from the authorities which I have consulted; and, indeed, from the nature of the case, they would require many

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

ous their faith may be in other respects, they are not idolaters, but worshippers of the God of heaven and earth. They do not reject Moses and the prophets, or consider Jesus an imposter. It is partly because you present for their acceptance a doctrine which contradicts the fundamental article of their belief, "God is one." And never, while the human mind is governed by rational evidence, will they surrender this immovable foundation of all true religion for what they consider a human invention. The same may be said of a great portion of the heathen world. The Hindoo can prove as clearly that his thirty millions of deities are but one God, as you can prove to him that your three persons or distinctions are but one Jehovah. But this is not the worst of the case. This doctrine is not only an insurmountable obstacle to the reception of the gospel by the Jews, heathen and Mohammedans, but it is also instrumental in driving many, who have been born and educated in christian lands, to open infidelity; and it likewise causes divisions and contentions of a very disastrous nature among professed disciples of Jesus. Could you bring to mind all the evils which it has occasioned in the church, all the wars it has fomented, all the blood it has spilled, you would shudder at the remembrance. And during all this warfare, no one pretends that he can find the doctrine laid down in any one passage of the whole Bible; no one pretends that he can give to it an intelligible explanation; no one pretends even that he can understand any thing concerning its true meaning. Truly, no one can doubt its injurious tendency, whether it be considered true or false. Let me entreat you to look attentively at this objection.

Thus you have the six reasons I spoke of for rejecting the doctrine of the Trinity. Until you have fully removed these I need not advance others of a similar character. Now I cannot believe either without evidence or contrary to convincing testimony; and, until you furnish a complete refutation of these arguments, I cannot receive this article of your human formulary of faith.

You will now ask, if those great and wise and good Christians, who receive the doctrine of the Trinity, have no scriptural evidence on which to rest their faith in this doctrine? They can produce but three passages from the whole Bible which have any direct bearing on the question. The texts which they adduce to prove that Christ is God and that the holy Spirit is God, even if the Trinitarian exposition of them

be correct, are, at best, only indirect evidence, and make the doctrine of the Trinity wholly a doctrine of mere inference. The only direct scriptural evidence which is claimed for this doctrine is contained in three single texts. Three single verses are all that have been or can be adduced as affording any express positive evidence of three persons or distinctions in the divine nature. These I now proceed to examine. The others to which I have alluded will be considered in a subsequent number.

You find the following words in the first epistle of John. "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one." Perhaps it is not known to every person that this passage constitutes no part of the Bible. It was never written by the Beloved Disciple. It was put into his letter many years after his death. This is the belief of the learned of all denominations. I shall, therefore, merely refer you to the writings of some of the greatest divines of several of the most prominent sects in Christendom. Are you a Methodist? Go to the Commentary of Dr. Adam Clarke, and you may find the following sentences:—"It is likely this verse is not genuine. It is wanting in every manuscript of this epistle written *before* the invention of printing, one excepted: the others which omit this verse amount to one hundred and twelve." Are you an Episcopalian? Listen to the following from Bishop Lowth:—"We have some wranglers in theology, sworn to follow their master, who are prepared to defend anything, however absurd, should there be occasion. But I believe there is no one among us, in the east degree conversant with sacred criticism, and having the use of his understanding, who would be willing to contend for the genuineness of this verse." Are you a Presbyterian? Hear the declaration of one of the most distinguished ministers of your denomination in England:—"We are unspeakably ashamed that any modern divine should have fought for the retention of a passage so notoriously spurious." Are you an Orthodox Congregationalist? Read the following confession of Professor Stuart, in the latest number of the Biblical Repository:—"I have only to say, that there is an overwhelming mass of critical evidence against the genuineness of it, as the state of the matter now is." I could fill many pages with similar quotations were it necessary. The state of the case, then, is precisely this: every Unitarian, who has given this subject a thorough investigation, rejects this verse.

as being no part of the Scriptures. When, therefore, you hear a minister quote it in preaching or conversation, you may be sure that he has not examined the question for himself, and that he is determined not to be governed by the testimony of the learned of his own denomination. You may be equally certain that no man will be willing to risk his reputation for learning and honesty, by quoting this passage, as a part of the Bible, in controversy with a Unitarian. — 1 John v. 7.

In an epistle of Paul you find the following text, which is quoted to prove the doctrine of the Trinity: "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the holy Ghost, be with you all." Now what does this passage prove? Examine it carefully. Does it teach that there are three persons or distinctions in the Godhead? Does it imply that the Father, Son, and Spirit are one God, the same in substance, and equal in power and glory? Nothing of the kind is either taught or implied; and, to my mind, a stronger text against the Trinity need not be adduced. Let us dissect it. "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ." Here is one person distinctly mentioned. Is he called God? Is he pronounced to be one person in the Trinity? Neither. He is called by a distinguished name, and what does this name mean? Who is the Lord Jesus Christ? This question is answered repeatedly in other parts of Scripture. He is the *Son* of that God, who gave him existence as the first-born of every creature, who imparted to him his Spirit without measure, made him both Lord and Christ, called him by a name which is above every name, and raised him from the dead after his crucifixion. Take the second clause of the sentence. "The love of God." What is the meaning of the word *God?* Does it mean the whole of Deity, or only one of the three persons in the Godhead? If you admit that it means, in this place, as it does in other places, *the whole* of God, then this verse destroys at once your doctrine. If you say that it means one third of God or one of the divine persons or distinctions, you must prove the truth of your assertion; and until you have established this position, you gain no assistance from this quotation. I make bold to declare that this essential requisite has never been proved, and never can be; and, consequently, that the word *God*, in this connexion, means the God and Father of Jesus, our heavenly Father, and the only true God. Take now the last clause. "The communion of

[illegible]

[illegible]

ulous agency of Deity. And in this sense we now administer this ordinance. I say to the parent who presents his children at the baptismal font, "By this act you engage to educate your child in a knowledge of the one true God, the universal Father; in a knowledge of Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of the Most High, the Saviour of the world; in a knowledge of those miracles which God wrought in confirmation of the divine mission of Jesus, and in all the truths of his well authenticated religion." I conclude, therefore, by saying, that this verse affords no direct evidence of the Trinity; and, when properly understood, is one of the strongest proofs against the doctrine. This is my serious and solemn conviction; but you must judge for yourselves. Matthew, xxviii. 18, 19.

These are all the passages which any divine of respectability would quote in defence of the Trinity. I know that several other texts are sometimes mentioned by the young and inexperienced. I will quote one, and show you that no better evidence is wanted to destroy the doctrine. "God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the holy Ghost." Now suppose I give a Trinitarian meaning to this sentence. I must alter it, thus: By the word God is meant the Father, the first person in the Trinity. This first person anointed Jesus, the second person, a being of the same substance with himself, and equal in power and glory. The first person anointed the second person with the holy Spirit, the third person in the Trinity, of the same substance of the other two, and equal in power and glory. Now I certainly intend no ridicule. If this explanation appear like a burlesque, you must blame the person who quoted the verse to prove the Trinity, and not my exposition. — See others of a similar character, in "Remarks on the Unitarian Belief, by Nehemiah Adams," pp. 79, 80.

Thus, christian brethren, have I given the subject of the Trinity as full a discussion as my present limits permit. I have stated some of the reasons why I reject this doctrine. In my next, I shall give the arguments for my belief in the simple unity of God.

B. Whitman.

Christianity and Reform.

THOUSANDS assure us that we live in a wonder-working age, and refer us for proof to man's conquests over the material world. We are told that man has attacked the elements and subdued them,—made the most hurtful comparatively harmless, and the most stubborn minister to his wants or his pleasures.

But man's moral conquests are far more striking proofs of his power, and are infinitely more encouraging to the philanthropist. Moral events which are to influence all coming generations, have succeeded, and are succeeding, each other with astonishing rapidity. It would seem that in these latter days, a new spirit has been breathed into the moral world. Mind breaks its long slumber and begins to exert its energies. Men begin to see the workings of a nobler nature, and to indulge and labour to embody visions of a higher and lovelier destiny for the human race.

A war rages—a war of opinion—between the past and the future, between the advocates of the old order of things, and those who demand new and better institutions for time to come. It extends to every thing. Nothing is too sacred to be attacked. Nothing in politics, in morals, or in religion, is too venerable for its age, too well established by experience, to escape the hand of the ruthless soldier of the *movement* party in this new and fearful war. Blows are struck at the very foundation of the existing social order, and the ruins of all once held sacred are exposed to the idle gaze of the multitude.

All over the world the war has commenced. All over the world the demand for reform is uttered, in some places, in sounds half suppressed and scarcely audible; but in others, in tones loud, determined, and startling. In all communities there is a deep feeling, there are full hearts, there are quickened spirits, that will dare improvements in man's moral and social condition, with the hero's courage, with the saint's singleness of purpose, and with the martyr's firmness. The millions awake. They begin to perceive, or imagine they perceive, that they have been trifled with, that they have tamely submitted to an order of things which, a little well directed exertion on their part would have exchanged for one immeasurably better. Urged on by a sense of real

or fancied wrongs, they are collecting their forces and nerving their souls to the battle.

Such is the rising spirit of the times. We may deny or seek to disguise it, but proofs meet the eye at every glance. We may denounce it, declaim or reason against it, call it dangerous, impious, blasphemous, or what we will; its course is onward, and no power on earth can stay its progress or scatter its gathering forces. It may pass over the earth with desolation and death, may sweep off everything well established in government, pure in morals, or venerable in religion, but it must and will have its course. Of this we may be assured, great and lasting changes will be effected. The day has gone by to prevent it. The work is too far advanced to be arrested. Will the changes to be introduced settle down into salutary reforms, or will they prove only mischievous innovations? This is no trifling question. The wise and the good ask it with solicitude, if not with alarm. What answer shall be returned?

It may be answered, that the results of the impending struggle will be good or bad, according to the alliances which may be formed. If the spirit at work ally itself to infidelity, nothing valuable will be gained; if to religion, the most satisfactory consequences may be predicted. This article will therefore labour to prove that no salutary reform can be effected by infidelity, and that the spirit of reform is, in fact, the very spirit of the gospel.

Those who are acquainted with man's whole nature require no proof of the first position here assumed. But these are not many. Enough has been witnessed, for a few years past, in our own country as well as in other countries, to convince us that those are not wanting who think they must commence reformers by making war upon the church, declaiming against the clergy, and breaking men loose from the restraints of religion. When the French reformer undertook to remodel society and to base his government on 'the rights of man,' he judged it necessary to reject religion. In England, at the present moment, many of the publications addressed to the labouring classes, publications which are the boldest and most popular advocates of reform, are either avowedly infidel, or else, under the pretence of opposing the Church Establishment, use arguments which strike at the foundation of religion itself. In our own country, within a few years, we have seen start up a large number of publications professedly advocating a radical reform in the social institutions of all coun-

tries, and, without a single exception, all have openly or covertly, attacked religion. Almost every young man, who learns, for the first time, that all, which is, is not right, charges the wrong he thinks he has discovered to the clergy, and believes himself aiding a reform by opposing them, and, too often, the cause they were set apart to defend. It is true, that he is soon cured of this folly, but seldom without the loss of those generous feelings by which he was governed. These are facts not without meaning. They admonish us that it is no work of supererogation to prove that infidelity can effect no real reform.

To effect any real reform, the individual man must be improved. The mass of mankind is made up of individuals. There is no such thing as reforming the mass without reforming the individuals who compose it. The mass of mankind is often spoken of as if it were a real individual; but in itself it is nothing. It has no head, no heart, no soul, no character, but as these exist in its individual members. Each member of the great whole has a separate existence, will, powers, duties of his own, and which cannot be merged in the mass. The reformer's concern is with the individual. That which gives to the individual a free mind, a pure heart, and full scope for just and beneficial action, is that which will reform the many. When the majority of any community are fitted for better institutions, for a more advanced state of society, that state will be introduced and those institutions will be secured. What the reformer, then, wants is the power to elevate the individual, to quicken in his soul the love of the highest excellence, and to urge him forward towards perfection with new and stronger impulses.

Will infidelity supply this power? Does infidelity seek to reform individual character? It is folly to pretend that it does. It attacks institutions. It deals only with some of the forms under which the errors of individual character may have been manifested, while it leaves the errors themselves untouched. It pronounces religion false, and its action on man's social relations mischievous. It declaims against government, but it does not propose a remedy for those depravities of individual character which render government necessary. Viewed in the most favourable light, it is powerless. Separated from what it often borrows from religion, it can present no motive to action. It has no power to kindle up a moral energy in the soul, and to arm it for a long and vigorous struggle for lofty and abiding virtue. The highest stand-

ard of morality it can recognise is expediency, and expediency for this short and transitory life.

Till within a few years, the unbeliever dreamed of no social reform, advocated no moral progress, imagined nothing better for man than the long train of existing abuses, unless, indeed, it were, that he should go back to the condition of the "untutored savage." What visions of a higher and better social existence than that they found already sustained, ever flitted across the minds of such men as Hobbes, Mandeville, Hume and Gibbon? What inward thirst, what promptings of the soul, had they for a purer virtue, a greater amount of human happiness — they, who seem to have had not the least sympathy with their fellow-beings? Indeed, what inducement can he who believes merely that he is to-day, and to-morrow will not be, — what inducement can he have to struggle with "the powers that be," to risk ease, property, reputation, perhaps life, to benefit those of whom he knows nothing, for whom he cares nothing, and who, like him, are only for a day, destined to flourish in the morning, to wither at noon, and to die ere it is night? Indeed, after the novelty of his disbelief has worn off, the unbeliever seldom troubles himself much about anything except his own immediate interests. He wraps himself up in his selfishness, looks in scorn upon the world, and bids it take care of itself. You often find him the loudest and most inveterate opponent of all useful changes. Where religion is popular, you may not unfrequently see him in the garb of the church, consoling himself for his hypocrisy by saying, Every man is selfish, following only his own selfish purposes, and that he must take the same course in self-defence. Long would reform sleep undisturbed, were it entrusted to the care of such as he!

It is true that infidelity, in these days, pretends to be a reformer. It speaks much of the debasement of the human mind, of the degradation of human nature, and makes loud and frequent demands for improvement; but, usually, without any clear conceptions of what would be an improvement, without any knowledge of what lies at the bottom of existing abuses, of man's wants and capabilities, or of what would supply the one or fully develope the other. One attributes all the wrong which exists to a mischievous government, another to the malign influence of certain indefinable, constantly varying external circumstances, another to the prevalence of religious belief, another to the priesthood, even where no priesthood exists, and so on to the end of the chapter. But in all their

speculations, the idea of improving the individual man, as the means of improving the body of which he is a member, seems never to have come across the minds of unbelievers. They demand radical changes, but seem to have no suspicion that there can be no radical changes in society, or if there can, that none are desirable, any farther than they may be rendered necessary by radical changes in individual character. In France, the unbeliever, for a time, had an open field and fair play. He began by overturning the whole fabric of society, and then reörganized it according to his own mind. As he had modelled his new institutions after the principles of his ideal perfection, he was surprised to find that they did not produce the results he had predicted. It did not, at first, occur to him, that his new institutions and the character of the individuals for whom he had provided them were not in harmony; and when he did learn this, he believed the shortest way to remove the discrepancy was to destroy nearly all the then existing generation. Hence, his reform became a reign of terror, and his efforts in behalf of free institutions have retarded the march of liberty for centuries. All this evil would have been avoided, had he perceived that his work should begin with the individual, that he should first raise the individual and develope the powers of the individual mind. Had he done this, he would have elevated the standard of morality, and produced a discrepancy between individual character and — not his new institutions — but the old, and this would have inevitably involved their destruction, and have necessarily introduced new ones, as perfect as the new standard of individual excellence would admit. The notion, that government and social institutions can produce and preserve any given description of individual character, would never have been entertained, and tyrants would not have been furnished with another plea for despotism, to save society from the horrors of anarchy.

In this country, we established a free government, not because we had reasoned ourselves into a belief of its superiority to all others, not because we believed it would produce and preserve the virtues of individual character, but because such were already the virtues and the intelligence of our citizens as individuals, that none other than a free government would have been in harmony with their character. That even a free government and comparatively perfect social institutions do not necessarily preserve a corresponding excellence in individual character, is obvious from what we are daily wit-

nessing among ourselves. Our people, as individuals, in the high uncompromising moral virtues, are very little, if at all, in advance of what they were at the commencement of our glorious struggle for freedom and national independence. We have thus far depended too much upon a free government and enlightened institutions, and have vainly thought to legislate people into high-toned moral beings. The better informed among us are daily perceiving the necessity of paying more and more attention to the culture of the individual mind. They are daily becoming better and better convinced that the only way to set the mass of our citizens forward in the career of virtuous improvement, is, to develope the capabilities of the individual man; to induce him to employ all his faculties in the accomplishment of just ends, and to exert all his energies to the perfecting of his own mind and heart.

Nothing, it should be added, will reform the individual, that does not appeal to his whole nature, and give full employment to all, especially his higher faculties. This infidelity cannot do. It addresses us as animals, not as men. It has no concern with the soul. It recognises no spirit in man, and, consequently, can appeal only to the body, to bodily appetites and bodily powers. It can give us no high and stirring views of our nature, no inducement to pure and elevated virtue, by assuring us that we are related to a Being who is infinitely great and supremely good, that we are kindred spirits and may attain to a kindred excellence with the everlasting God. In one word, it can make no appeal to the religious sentiment, can furnish nothing on which the religious affections can lay hold, and from which they may derive purity, strength, and delight. In this it leaves out a part, and that the noblest part, of our nature.

It is not necessary to prove that the religious sentiment is a part of our nature. We see this, we feel and know it. All ages, all countries, and nearly all individuals have the sentiment, and manifest it in combination with some form of religion. True, some few of our race have not always felt the inward workings of the religious sentiment, but to infer from this, that it is not natural to man, would be as absurd as to pretend that hunger and thirst are not natural, because, in certain morbid states of the stomach, there is felt no appetite for food or drink. Take away God and religion from the soul, its moral life dies, as quickly as does the body when deprived of wholesome nutriment. The soul hungers and thirsts for religion. Religion is its meat and drink; its bread

of life; and is as strongly craved, as much needed for its growth and healthy action, as is food or drink for the body. How, then, can we hope to find the individual man morally strong and healthy, when deprived of this nutriment of the soul? Without this he must inevitably pine away, wither into a mere animal, to vegetate, propagate its species, and die. Yet of this would infidelity deprive us, and to this wretched fate would it abandon us.

No change, which does not tend to give free and full scope for the just exercise of all our faculties, can be a real reform. The only error of the present state of things is, that it infringes right action, supplies motives to wrong, and prevents the full development of the individual mind. What we want, are such changes, such improvements, as will develope, employ, task to their fullest extent, and rightly direct, all the faculties of our common nature. But such, infidelity cannot effect. Denying the religious sentiment, it can assign no place for its developement; discarding all the pious affections, it can afford them no employment in its new-modelled society, and shape nothing to their wants; contemplating only the human animal, it can make provision only for animal wants; and having no use for the spiritual nature, it must do all it can to break and destroy its power. Let any man ascertain accurately how large a portion of his nature finds employment only in that which belongs to religion, or is in some way dependant on the religious sentiment, and he may easily satisfy himself, whether infidelity would be likely to reörganize society, so as to give full scope for the free, vigorous and healthy exercise of our whole nature.

Now as infidelity does not propose to do this, has never done it, and never can do it, it can produce no salutary reform. The institutions it would introduce would always be opposed to the developement of much of our nature, and to individual improvement; consequently, they would be mischievous. They would place the social and the individual man in a state of perpetual war; the spiritual and the animal nature in an eternal struggle. The bosom would be torn by contending factions; government would be one thing to-day, and another to-morrow, and nothing would be fixed but anarchy and confusion.

That infidelity and the spirit of reform have sometimes been found in alliance, is not denied; but this alliance is unnatural, and has never produced anything worth preserving. Reformers have sometimes erred. Animated by a strong

desire for human improvement, feeling an undying love for man, they have freely devoted themselves to his emancipation, and to the promotion of his endless progress towards perfection; but they have not always had clear conceptions of what would be an improvement, of the good attainable, nor of the practicable means of attaining it. Their zeal may have flowed from pure hearts, but it has not always been guided by just knowledge. They have often excited needless alarm, waged needless war, declaimed when they should have reasoned, censured when they should have pitied and consoled, awakened resentment when they should have gained confidence and attracted love. The consequence is, that they have been opposed by their natural friends, and this has obliged them to league with their natural enemies.

In the contest, the reformer has excited the alarms of the religious and armed against himself the guardians of the faith. He has met the minister of the church commanding him in the name of God to desist, and assuring him, that if he take another step forward, he does it at the peril of his soul's salvation. When the French reformer rose against the mischievous remains of the feudal system and the severe exactions of a superannuated tyranny, he found the church leagued with the abuses he would correct. Those who lived upon her revenues bade him retire. The anathema met his advance and repelled his attacks; and he was induced to believe there was no place whereon to erect the palace of liberty and social order, but the ruins of the temple.

Yet his cause was most eminently a religious cause. It was not that the spirit of reform was an infidel spirit, that it was opposed by the professed friends of religion. All reforms come from the lower classes, who are always the sufferers; and they are usually opposed by the higher classes, who live by those very abuses, or who are the higher classes in consequence of those very abuses which the reformer would redress. These classes, whether hereditary, elective, or fortuitous,—whether composed of the same individuals or of different ones,—have always the same spirit, and the same interests. The old order of things is that which elevates them; and that order of things they, of course, must feel it their interest to maintain. Hence it is, that the upper classes of society, all who are under the direct influence of those classes, and all who hope one day to make a part of them, are almost always opposed to all radical changes, and consequently to all real reform. In most countries, the ministers of

religion, especially the higher orders of the hierarchy, make up a part of the higher and privileged classes, and hence the reason why they oppose the reformer, and force him into the ranks of the unbeliever. They, from their position, feel no need of a reform in the moral and social institutions of the community, and hope nothing from a change; and, as they are supposed to be like other men, they can but oppose it; they always have done so, and they always will do so, till they are made sensible that they must lose all their influence, and their means of benefiting themselves or others by continuing their opposition.

It is because the ministers of religion have, in most countries and in most ages of the world, formed one of the higher classes, or constituted one of the privileged orders, that we have so uniformly found them, in past times at least, advocates of the stationary principle. Where a man's treasure is, there will be his heart; and they had their treasure, they always have their treasure, in the existing order of things. This were no subject of complaint, were the existing order always the best order; were not progress a law of our nature and an inevitable condition of human society; were we able at any given time to reach the perfect, instead of being destined to be eternally approaching it. But such is not the fact. Man's course is onward. No state of society is perfect. No form of religion has ever yet been extensively embraced but it had its imperfections. Christianity has been everywhere presented under forms which ever have been and ever will be opposed, as mind advances and there is felt the want of something more liberal and more refined. Admit that the spirit of Christianity is always the same, yet its forms may be changed to suit the changes of individuals and of societies, and were this done no difficulty would occur. But its ministers and its professed friends declare religion to be identified with forms which have become revolting, and thus the reformer is driven from their company to that of the infidel.

It is never religion itself that the reformer opposes. He finds the gospel adulterated; he finds a foul and unnatural mixture presented him in the place of pure religion, and it is always those parts which are foreign to religion, but which are presented with it, that excite his hostility. Yet, in opposing the mixture, he may sometimes, innocently, because unintentionally, oppose the pure; in attacking the abuse, he may sometimes inadvertently strike the thing abused; in warring against the wrong-headed advocate, he may war

against religion itself. He may not always clearly discriminate in his own mind; and if he should not, he is not more guilty than thousands who pass for good Christians. And should he make the proper distinctions in his own mind, he may fail to make others perceive them; for the vast majority of mankind identify religion with the abuses he would correct; and we need not, perhaps, be either surprised or angry, if, in his zeal for reform, wearied with effort after effort, opposed on every hand, and persecuted by the servants of the temple, he come to the conclusion, that it is best to cut the knot, and reject religion entirely. Men have so done, they may continue to do so, but no genuine friend to man ever did or ever will come to this conclusion, till driven to it by the professed guardians of the faith, "who neither enter into the kingdom of heaven themselves, nor suffer those that would to enter."

This should induce no Christian to decry reform. It should rather lead him to inquire, if he be not supporting religion under a form which is opposed to the progress of mind. The "overflowing scourge," which will sweep off "every refuge of lies," is now passing over the earth, and well doth it import us to surrender voluntarily whatever we love that is not based on eternal truth, that is not absolutely essential to the existence and free and healthy action of the religious sentiment. Well doth it import us all to return to the simplicity of the gospel, and to refuse, henceforth, to defend religion under any form not consistent with the endless progress of human reason and the ever advancing state of human society.

The consideration of my second position, namely, that the spirit of reform is in fact the very spirit of religion, is reserved for another number; as more room has been already occupied than was intended.

O. A. Brownson.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

THE BOOK OF MORMON.

An Account, written by the Hand of Mormon upon Plates, taken from the Plates of Nephi. By JOSEPH SMITH, JR., Author and Proprietor.

THIS is the title of the volume which contains the collection of writings held sacred by the Mormonites: in other words, it is the title of the Mormon Bible. The Mormonites, as they are commonly called, or, as they call themselves, the members of the true church of Christ, — as our readers are probably aware, are a new denomination of religionists. It is but a few years since they made their appearance in the western part of the state of New York. They have already met with some success in the spread of their opinions; and preachers of this denomination are now scattering themselves abroad over the land, labouring with much zeal to gain proselytes to their faith. The account which has been given of the origin of their sacred writings is, briefly, this: — Joseph Smith, Jr., whose name appears on the title-page as author and proprietor of the work, was directed by the Spirit of God to dig, in a hill in the "township of Manchester, Ontario county, N. Y.," for certain golden plates, which were there concealed, and upon which were inscribed sacred records. He obeyed the direction and found the plates. The inscriptions upon them were in an unknown tongue. But, by the special power of the Spirit, Smith was enabled to translate them. This translation is the volume, the title of which is placed at the head of this article. To confirm the truth of this account, the volume contains two certificates, one of which is signed by three, and the other by eight witnesses. The three witnesses testify, "That an Angel of God came down from heaven, and he brought and laid before our eyes, that we beheld and saw the plates and the engravings thereon." The eight witnesses testify, "We have seen and hefted, and know of a surety that the said Smith has got the plates of which we have spoken, — and we also saw the engravings thereon, all of which has the appearance of ancient work and of curious workmanship."

The volume contains a collection of writings, or, as they are called, of different Books, purporting to have been written at different times, and by the different authors whose names they respectively bear. The following are the names of the different Books, in the order in which they occur.

1. First Book of Nephi.
2. Second Book of Nephi.
3. Book of Jacob, brother of Nephi.
4. Book of Enos, son of Jacob.
5. Book of Jarom, son of Enos.
6. Book of Omni, son of Jarom.
7. Words of Mormon.
8. Book of Mosiah.
9. Book of Alma.
10. Book of Helaman.
11. Book of Nephi, son of Nephi, son of Helaman.
12. Book of Nephi, son of Nephi, one of the disciples of Christ.
13. Book of Mormon.
14. Book of Ether.
15. Book of Moroni.

We shall not undertake to give a particular analysis of each of these Books. We shall give only a brief outline of the contents of the whole. The volume is composed of what purport to be, historical records, prophetical declarations, and direct exhortatory addresses. The following is a brief sketch of what purport to be the historical records of the volume.

One Lehi, a devout and holy man, was moved by the threatenings of Jeremiah and other prophets who foretold the destruction of Jerusalem, to flee from that devoted city. He left in the first year of the reign of Zedekiah king of Judah. From Jerusalem he went forth into the wilderness. After having travelled for three days, he pitched his tent in a valley, by the side of a river which emptied into the Red Sea. Lehi left behind, in Jerusalem, as he went forth, all his riches, and took with him only his family, which consisted of his wife Sarai and four sons, Laman, Lemuel, Sam, and Nephi. After he had pitched his tent, he sent his sons back to Jerusalem, to obtain the plates which contained the genealogical records of his family, that the remembrance of their origin might be preserved among his descendants. His sons succeeded in obtaining the plates, from which it appeared that Lehi was a descendant of Joseph, the son of Jacob, who was sold into Egypt. Again, Lehi sent his sons back to Jerusalem to seek out for themselves wives, who might go forth with them wherever the Lord should direct. The sons persuade one Ishmael to unite himself unto them, and to go forth into the wilderness, with his family, which consisted of daughters. The whole company now journey along the coast of the Red Sea for some days, and then strike off and journey in a direction due east, until they come to the great waters. Here, Nephi was directed of the Lord to construct a vessel; and being assisted by the Spirit, he at length succeeded, notwithstanding his elder brothers laughed him to scorn for his attempt. The vessel is completed, and the whole company now

launch forth upon "the mighty deep." It is impossible to ascertain, precisely, from what place they sailed; and, as the direction and length of their voyage are not particularly mentioned, we lose all further geographical traces of them. During the voyage, the elder brothers, Laman and Lemuel, refuse to submit to their younger brother, Nephi. They rise in mutiny, seize Nephi, bind him hand and foot, and beat him with rods. While Nephi lay bound, a tempest arose, and they were driven from their proper course. As Nephi was the only one that had been instructed of the Lord in regard to the management of the vessel, the elder brothers, through fear, released him and restored him to the command. They at length arrive at a land unknown to the rest of the world. After their arrival, Laman and Lemuel revolted from the command of Nephi. This laid the foundation for two general divisions, called Lamanites and Nephites. These names came, however, in the course of time, to denote distinctions of character, rather than difference of family descent. Those, who disbelieved and disobeyed, were classed with the Lamanites, while the believing and the obedient were ranked with the Nephites. These two general divisions were each divided into various subordinate tribes. They scattered themselves over the land, cultivated the earth, built cities and towns. They enjoyed prosperity or experienced adversity, as the people were obedient or disobedient. There were frequent wars between the Lamanites and Nephites, and victory sided sometimes with one party and sometimes with the other. The history is more directly that of the Nephites, and it is only incidentally that we are made acquainted with the affairs of the Lamanites. The Nephites were sometimes governed by kings and sometimes by judges. After the ascension of our Saviour, as recorded in the New Testament, he is represented to have appeared to the Nephites. While among them, he healed the diseased, and gave religious instruction. The religious instruction, which he gave, accords well with what is recorded of his discourses in the New Testament, since it is but a copy, almost word for word, from those discourses. After our Saviour had ascended from the Nephites, his gospel was preached and spread rapidly among the Nephites and among a part of the Lamanites. But, at length, the Nephites "dwindled in unbelief;" the infidel portion of the inhabitants gained the ascendency, the true believers became extinct, and the plates, which contained the records of the nation, were "hid up unto the Lord in the earth, to be brought forth in due time by the hand of the Gentile."

Such is a brief sketch of the historical records contained in the Book of Mormon. In all this history, there is but one allusion which affords us an intelligible hint in regard to the geography of the land, in which the Nephites and Lamanites dwelt.

There is, incidentally, mention made of a narrow neck of land, which connects the North country with the South, which, we suppose, means the Isthmus of Darien. The preachers of this faith, we understand, endeavour to prove the truth of the history by a reference to the face of the country. They suppose the mounds throughout the western states, which have heretofore excited so much curiosity, are the remains of the cities of the Nephites and Lamanites.

The prophetical declarations of the Book of Mormon relate to the prosperity and adversity of the people to whom they are addressed, to the coming of Christ, and to "the hiding up of the plates and their being brought forth by the hand of the Gentile;" together with denunciations of woe upon all, who, at the time the plates may be brought forth, shall object to "more Bible" and shall contend that miracles have ceased. The prophecies which relate to the prosperity and adversity of the people, are, many of them, clothed in the language of the Jewish prophets; or, in other words, are composed of expressions taken from the prophetical writings of the Old Testament. In one instance, the Prophet, instead of making new disclosures, professes simply to read to the people from the prophecy of Isaiah, and, consequently, we have several chapters of that Book, copied almost word for word. The prophecies in regard to the coming of Christ and his precursor, John the Baptist, are more definite than the prophecies of the Old Testament, being clothed, for the most part, in the language of the New Testament, or in the language of modern theology. We find the following prophecy in regard to John the Baptist: —

"And he spake also concerning a prophet, which should come before the Messiah to prepare the way of the Lord; yea, even he should go forth and cry in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord and make his paths straight; for there standeth one among you whom ye know not, and he is mightier than I, whose shoe's latchet I am not worthy to unloose. And much spake my father concerning this thing. And my Father saith, that he should baptize in Bethabara, beyond Jordan; and he also spake that he should baptize with water, yea, even that he should baptize the Messiah with water. And after that he had baptized the Messiah with water, he should behold and bear record, that he had baptized the Lamb of God, which should take away the sins of the world."

We find the following prophetical vision of the times of the Saviour: —

"And it came to pass, that the angel spake unto me again, saying, Look! And I looked, and beheld the Lamb of God, that he was taken by the people, yea, the Everlasting God was judged of the world. And I, Nephi, saw that he was lifted up upon the cross and slain for the sins of the world."

We find the following prophetical declarations, which have reference, we presume, to the present times: —

"And because my words shall hiss forth, many of the Gentiles shall say, A Bible, a Bible: we have got a Bible, and there cannot be any more Bible. . . . . Wherefore, because that ye have a Bible, ye need not suppose that it contains all my words, neither need ye suppose that I have not caused more to be written."

From these quotations our readers may gain some idea of the character of the prophecies contained in the Book of Mormon.

In regard to the exhortations, there is one singular circumstance. We should naturally suppose, that, coming, as Lehi and his family are represented to have done, from Jerusalem, there would be some traces of Jewish manners and customs among the people. But we are disappointed. Nephi did, indeed, build a temple, after the manner of Solomon's temple. But we see no account of sacrifices and of national festivals, and but an allusion to synagogues. No. The moment they are established in their new land, we read of the church, of preaching, according to the modern style of preaching, of converts, dissenters, and of baptism. The exhortations are strongly tinctured with the doctrines of modern Christianity. Those given before are nearly the same with those given after the Saviour's appearance. In the one case, the people were exhorted to believe that a Saviour would come and that an atonement would be made; in the other, that a Saviour had come and that an atonement had been made. We find the following account of an interview between Ammon, one of the preachers, and the king, which may serve as a specimen of the exhortations. This interview took place, we would observe, before the appearance of our Saviour.

"And it came to pass that when Ammon saw that the King would believe his words he began from the creation of Adam, reading the Scriptures unto the king, how God created man after his own image, and that God gave the commandments unto man, and that because of transgression man fell. And Ammon did expound unto him the Scriptures from the creation of Adam, laying the fall of man before him, and their carnal state, and all the plan of redemption which was prepared from the foundation of the world, through Christ, for all whosoever would believe on his name. And it came to pass that when Ammon had spoken all these things unto the king, he did ask him if he believed the words which he had spoken, and the king said unto him, I believe all the words which thou hast spoken, if thou hast power to do this thing which thou art desirous that I should believe, for I believe that the Great Spirit has sent you to do good to my people, and I desire that I may be your servant and my people shall be your people, and we will be your servants."

We have thus given a brief sketch of the contents of the whole book. In regard to the style in which the book is written, we have but little to say. There is all possible variety in the style of the sacred Scriptures. So in the Book of Mormon. Some of the book, for instance, is in the narrative, simple and unadorned style. Nearly one-third of the book is in the paragraphs and phraseology of the prophets. And it came to pass."

In endeavouring to preserve the solemn style of the Scriptures, there is a total disregard of grammatical propriety. We read, "The Lord sayeth unto me, and I *sayeth* unto the Lord." But perhaps a few extracts, selected at random, will give our readers a more correct idea of the general style of the book, than any remarks we might offer.

"And it came to pass that when they had *arriven* in the borders of the land of the Lamanites."

"And it came to pass that I Nephi did make *bellowses* wherewith to blow the fire."

"And it came to pass that Limhi and many of his people *was* desirous to be baptized."

We might fill our pages with quotations like these. We will, however, bring forward but one or two more. On page 182, we find Abinadi, a true prophet of the Lord, breaking forth into sublime strains of holy indignation against the false prophets, who had caused the people to pervert the ways of the Lord. The following is the passage: —

"And now Abinadi saith unto them, 'Are you priests, and pretend to teach this people, and to understand the spirit of prophesying, and yet desireth to know of me, what these things mean? I say unto, Wo be unto you for perverting the ways of the Lord. For if ye understand these things, ye have not taught them, therefore ye have perverted the ways of the Lord. Ye have not applied your hearts to understanding, therefore ye have not been wise. Therefore what teachest thou this people? And they said, we teach the law of Moses. And again he saith unto them, if ye teach the law of Moses, why do ye not keep it? Why do ye set your hearts upon riches? Why do ye spend your strength upon harlots, yea, and cause this people to commit sin, that the Lord hath cause to send me, to prophesy against this people, yea, even a great evil against this people? Knowest thou not that I speak the truth? Yea, thou knowest that I speak the truth; and you had ought to tremble before God."

On page 515, we learn what to expect during the period of the much-talked-of Millenium. For we find a description of the state of society among the Nephites, at a time when the influence of religion was universally felt. At that time, we are told, "there were no robbers, nor no murderers, neither were there Lamanites, nor no manner of Ites."— But we have satisfied our readers, we trust, with specimens of the style of the Book of Mormon. We will only add, that the different writers seem to have been all educated in the same school, since the same style is manifest in the writings of all.

That the Mormon faith has spread, with some degree of rapidity, since its first appearance, cannot be disputed. We are told, that there are already six hundred preachers of this faith, scattered abroad over the land. We have, therefore, in reading

the Book of Mormon, sought carefully for the peculiarities which are calculated to give it success, and we have also inquired as to the course pursued by the preachers in setting forth their views. There is some degree of plausibility, both in the course pursued by the preachers, and in the contents of the book itself. The course pursued by the preachers we understand is this. They state, what all admit to be facts, that, in the primitive ages of the church, there was among the disciples the power of speaking with tongues and of working miracles; that, at the present day, no denomination of Christians possesses this power. From these facts they draw the conclusion, that all denominations of Christians have departed from the true faith of the primitive church. They then claim for themselves and the members of their church the power of speaking with tongues and of working miracles. They jabber with some strange sounds, and call this the speaking with tongues. They assert it as a fact, that among them the dead have been raised and the sick healed. From these *facts*, as they call them, they draw the conclusion that *they* are the members of the true church of Christ. If you object to the historical accounts of their sacred books, they refer you to the mounds of the western country, as remains of ancient cities, and as proofs that this country was once inhabited by a race of people better acquainted with the arts of civilized life, than the present race of savages; and this, they contend, is satisfactory presumptive proof of the truth of the history. Do you ask, what reason there is to believe that our Saviour, after his ascension, appeared to the former inhabitants of America? They answer you in the words of their sacred books, in what purport to be the words of our Saviour himself while among the Nephites: —

"And verily I say unto you, that ye are they, of which I said, Other sheep I have which are not of this fold, them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd. And they understood me not, for they supposed it had been the Gentiles."

Now all this presents itself to the minds of the ignorant, as being plausible, as being forcible. They see not the sophistry. They know not what answer to give, and they are consequently carried away. In addition to all this, the preachers do not shock previously existing attachments, by rejecting the Bible. They profess to receive the whole Bible, just as it stands, and to regard it just as Christians generally regard it. They direct their hearers to search the Scriptures, and they themselves undertake to explain the declarations of the Old and New Testaments. They bring forward the Book of Mormon as another and more clear and distinct revelation, given to another branch of the descendants of Abraham, but as corresponding in its design and its general tenor with the sacred Scriptures.

And then, too, the book itself is with some art adapted to the known prejudices of a portion of the community. It is well known, that, among a portion of the community, there is a strong prejudice against the support, by the people, of a regular ministry. All such will find in the Book of Mormon, that, among the members of the true church, the preachers did not set themselves above the people, that they laboured with their own hands for the supply of their wants, that, when the period of religious worship arrived, the preachers, as well as the people, went from their labours to their devotions, and that, when this period had passed, the preachers, as well as the people, returned to their labours.

Again, it is well known, that, among some, there are complaints that officers of government should be supported in what they regard a life of ease and laziness, by salaries, drawn from the pockets of the hard-labouring people, in the form of taxes. All such will find in the Book of Mormon, that those rulers are spoken of as most acceptable in the sight of God, who laboured, working with their hands, for the supply of their wants, that so the people might not be burdened with taxes for their support; and, consequently, all such are led to hope, that, when the doctrines of the Book of Mormon, or the true faith of the primitive church, shall prevail, they shall be freed from taxes for the support of government.

Still further, it is well known that, in some minds, there is a prejudice against fine clothing, or even against decent apparel, as indicating pride in the wearer. Those, who are under the influence of this prejudice, find something in the Book of Mormon to suit their taste. They find that calamities were often brought upon the Nephites, through the pride of those who wore costly apparel. They find that, on one occasion, when the devout were blessed of the Lord with worldly prosperity, they had, among other things, great supplies of "homely clothing."

Finally, it is well known that, in many minds, there is a strong feeling of opposition to the institution of Masonry. All such find something in the Book of Mormon to meet their views. They find that, at a certain time,

"Satan did stir up the hearts of the more parts of the Nephites, insomuch that they did unite with those bands of robbers, and did enter into their covenants and their oaths, that they would protect and preserve one another, in whatever difficult circumstances they should be placed in, that they should not suffer for their murders and their plunderings and their stealings. And it came to pass, that they did have their signs, yea, their secret signs, and their secret words, and this, that they might distinguish a brother who had entered into the covenant, that, whatsoever wickedness his brother should do, he should not be injured by his brother, nor by those who did belong to his band who had taken this covenant; and whosoever of their band should reveal unto the world their

wickedness and their abominations, should be tried, not according to the laws of their country, but according to the laws of their wickedness, which had been given by Gadianton and Kishkumen. Now behold, those secret oaths and covenants did not come forth unto Gadianton from the records which were delivered unto Helaman; but behold, they were put into the heart of Gadianton by that same being who did entice our first parents to partake of the forbidden fruit."

Thus there are, in the book itself, artful adaptations to the known prejudices of the community. And, besides, there are circumstances, in the condition and views of those among whom this faith spreads, which are calculated to secure it success. In a large portion of the community, there is a great degree of ignorance in regard to the geography of the sacred Scriptures, the manners and customs of the Jews, and the natural history of the Bible. There are many, who read their Bibles daily, and with devotional feelings it may be, who have no idea that the places mentioned in sacred history, like those mentioned in any other history, can be traced on the map, can be found and visited at the present day, although disguised under modern names. It makes no part of their study of the Bible, to ascertain where the places mentioned are to be found, and what they are now called. They have no idea that the allusions to manners and customs, found in the Bible, can be understood, through an acquaintance with the practices and habits of the people described; and, consequently, the study of Jewish manners and customs makes no part of their preparation for understanding the Scriptures. They have no idea that the allusions in Scripture to facts in natural history can be verified by an acquaintance with that science; and, consequently, they make no exertions to understand the natural history of the Bible. They do not take up the Bible and read it with the expectation of being able to understand it, even in regard to these particulars, as they would understand any other book. All such are prepared, by their very ignorance on these subjects, to become the dupes of the Mormon delusion; or, rather, they are not prepared to detect and withstand this delusion. They open the Book of Mormon. The paragraphs begin with the phrase, "And behold it came to pass." They read of the cities of Zarahemla, Gid, Mulek, Corianton, and a multitude of others. They read of prophets and preachers, of faith, repentance, and obedience; and having been accustomed, in reading the Scriptures, to take all such things just as they are presented, without careful examination, they can see no reason why all this is not as much entitled to belief, as are the records of the Old and New Testaments. But if, on the contrary, they were acquainted with the geography and the natural history of the Bible, and with the manners and customs of the nations there mentioned, and especially, if, in

their reading of the Scriptures, they were accustomed to examine carefully into these points, they would at once perceive the utter impossibility of identifying the cities mentioned in the Book of Mormon, with any geographical traces which they can now make. They would thus perceive the great chance there is for deception, and would be put on their guard. And then, too, upon further examination, they would discover that the manners and customs of the people, the sentiments and disputes, are not such as belong to the period of the world in which the people are represented to have lived, that they take their colouring from modern customs, from modern opinions and controversies; and so they would, from this knowledge, and from these habits of examination, be led to reject the whole as a delusion.

Again, there prevail, in the minds of a large portion of the community, pernicious errors in regard to the influences of the Spirit. There are those, who believe that they can certainly tell, from their own feelings at the time, when the Spirit is specially operating upon their hearts; that they can distinguish the operations of the Spirit from the workings of their own minds. There are those who believe that they can tell, from the appearance of an assembly, when the Spirit of God is specially and powerfully present in "their midst." If the speaker is more than usually earnest and fluent, they believe that the Spirit of God is present to his mind, affording special assistance. If the assembly is more than usually interested, and, especially, if many are affected unto tears, they believe the Spirit of God to be powerfully operating upon the hearts of the people. The language, used by preachers and in religious periodical publications, encourages this belief. Go to the camp-meeting ground, or into a protracted meeting, and you will hear the preachers declaring that the Spirit of God is specially and powerfully present. And what is the proof? The speakers felt great freedom in laying open the truths of the gospel, and great earnestness in exhorting sinners. The people were much affected, and many were in tears. Turn to the religious periodical publications of the day, and read the accounts given of revivals. You will read, that on such an occasion, at such a meeting, the Spirit of God was visibly present. The proofs are the same as those mentioned by the preachers. Nay, more; these revivals, these special manifestations of the Spirit, are represented as proofs that the doctrines advanced at such times are the truths of the gospel, and that the measures adopted are "owned of God." The great mass of the more ignorant part of the community understand these expressions to mean what they literally purport to mean. And this, as it seems to us, has given success to many of the delusions that have prevailed. It is well known to most of our readers, we presume, that, some years since, the Cochran delusion, as it is called, prevailed in and

around Saco, a village in the State of Maine. What gave that delusion success? Why, Cochran spoke with great fluency, warned sinners with great earnestness, and poured forth his prayers with great fervour. The people were much affected. Many were in tears, many were sobbing aloud, many cried out for mercy, and some were even prostrated upon the floor. "Surely, then," those under the influence of the delusion we speak of would say, "the Spirit of God was powerfully and visibly present." "Surely," they would say, "the doctrine advanced by Cochran must be true, the ministers ordained by him are owned of God!" So with the Mormon delusion. The preachers are fluent, they warn sinners with earnestness, they pray with fervour; the people are affected; the Spirit of God is especially, powerfully, and visibly present; and, consequently, the opinions advanced must be correct, the ministers ordained are "owned of God." In this [illegible] respects, are carried away [illegible] views of the [illegible] Spirit and [illegible] of the delusion.

We [illegible] Book of Mormon and the [illegible] Mormon delusion. We [illegible] the natural [illegible] Nay, more: we [illegible] of [illegible] prejudices [illegible] Scriptures [illegible] Bible, and [illegible] religion and [illegible] Spirit. JOSIAH WHITMAN.

NOTICE

[illegible] series of Letters [illegible] a [illegible] who [illegible] of [illegible] age in [illegible] the [illegible] well [illegible] would [illegible] respecting [illegible] forces [illegible] to put [illegible] be mate- [illegible] I shall direct [illegible] mobile good.

JOSIAH WHITMAN.

NOTE.

It is our intention to notice all the books and pamphlets which we may receive. We would, therefore, respectfully request authors and publishers to forward to us copies of their respective publications.

It is also our intention to furnish a much greater variety of matter in future numbers. Our articles will not, generally, be so long; and, consequently, we can more easily gratify the wishes of our readers.

Several articles of interest are necessarily omitted for want of room. We request our correspondents to continue their favours. We likewise solicit communications from the friends of truth in all quarters of our country.

The Editors will hold themselves responsible for no articles except such as bear their own signatures.

☞ *It is requested of all persons to whom this number of* THE UNITARIAN *may be sent, in case they do not wish to become subscribers, to return it in an envelope to the Publishers.*

UNIVERSITY BOOKSTORE.

The Subscribers, having formed a connexion in business, as Publishers, Booksellers, and Stationers, under the firm of JAMES MUNROE AND COMPANY, would respectfully announce, that they have purchased the stock in trade of Messrs. BROWN, SHATTUCK, & CO., late *Booksellers to the University*, and have succeeded to their stand and business. They would likewise give notice, that they have this day taken into copartnership Mr. GEORGE FISKE, — the style of the firm continuing as above stated.

JAMES MUNROE, JR.
GEORGE NICHOLS.

JAMES MUNROE AND CO.,

Booksellers to the University.

Offer for sale their rich and extensive stock of Books and Stationary, on the most liberal terms, for cash, or approved credit.

The reputation of THE UNIVERSITY BOOKSTORE, as possessing the best editions of the Greek and Latin Classics, together with the standard works in modern literature, European, English, and American, has been long since sufficiently well established. It will ever be an object of our highest ambition to maintain this reputation. Our customers may accordingly depend on our using our best endeavours to continue our supply of such books.

Our stock of MATHEMATICAL Works, it is believed, is one rarely to be met with in this country. Among this stock are the works of the most distinguished French mathematicians, Laplace, Lagrange, Euler, Lacroix, Legendre, Callet, Carnot, Poisson, Bigot, &c. &c., in the original and translated, together with the English and American treatises, in the various departments of this science.

The standard works on LAW, and of the best editions, are kept constantly on sale.

THEOLOGY will at all times constitute an important department of our stocks. Among our works in this branch, will always be found the writings of the most distinguished divines, early and contemporary, German, English, and American.

Sunday-School and Parish Libraries will be promptly furnished, to order, on the most liberal terms.

Orders for any work published rather in this country or in Europe will be attended to without delay.

The establishment of an hourly communication with the city, by coaches and baggage-wagons, enables us to assure distant customers of the execution of all orders transmitted by mail, with about the same despatch as can be had in Boston.

It being our intention to have stated prices for all our books, persons residing at a distance, who may favour us with their orders, may depend on being served on precisely the same terms with purchasers on the spot.

A full catalogue of our stock will shortly be issued, and furnished to customers *gratis*.

James Munroe & Co. are publishers of the following works; —

Butler's Works, 2 vols.
Do. Analogy.
Bowring's Matins and Vespers.
Economy of Human Life.
Hildreth's Lives of the Apostles.
Hartley's Prayers.
Locke on St. Paul's Epistles.
Memoirs of Oberlin, with an Introductory Essay, by Rev. Henry Ware, Jr.
Norton's Statement of Reasons for not believing the Doctrines of Trinitarians.
Peirce's History of Harvard College.
Paley's Complete Works, 6 vols.
Library of Old English Prose Writers.
Vol. 1, containing Fuller's Holy State.
" 2, containing Sidney's Defence of Poesy and Selden's Table-Talk.
" 3, containing Miscellaneous Works of Sir T. Browne.
" 4, containing Felltham's Resolves.
Vol. 5 and 6, containing Walton's Lives.
" 7, containing Selections from Latimer.
" 8, containing Selections from Jeremy Taylor.
The Complete Works of Dugald Stewart, 7 vols.
Tucker's Light of Nature, 4 vols.
Worcester on the Atonement.
Worcester's Last Thoughts on Important Subjects.
Whately's Rhetoric.
Whitman's Letters to a Universalist.
Ware on the Formation of the Christian Character.
Watson's Apology for the Bible.
Ware's Sunday Library.
Vol. 1, containing The Life of the Saviour, by Rev. Henry Ware, Jr.
Vol. 2, containing The Life of Howard the Philanthropist, by Mrs. John Farrar.

JUST PUBLISHED,

Ware's Life of the Saviour, *stereotype edition*.

The Childhood of Jesus, a Christmas Gift from a Pastor to the Children of his Flock.

Will be put to press, immediately,

Volume 3, of Ware's Sunday Library, being *The Holy Land and its Inhabitants*. By Rev. S. G. Bulfinch, of Augusta, Georgia.

Views of Christian Truth, Piety, and Morality, selected from the writings of Dr. Priestley, with an Introductory Notice of his Life and Character. By Rev. Henry Ware, Jr.

Liberal terms will be allowed to authors who may favour us with the publications of their works. No pains will be spared to bring out all books in good style and with despatch, and to give them extensive circulation.

Stanford Library
MAY 15 1945

THE

UNITARIAN.

Vol. I. FEBRUARY, 1834. No. 2.

CONTENTS.

Page.

Christianity and Reform 61
Pauperism 69
Letters to Trinitarians and Calvinists. No. II. *The Unity.* 67
Letters from the South. No. I. 72
The Son of Man 78
Letters to Unbelievers. No. I. *Nature and Causes of Infidelity.* 85

Notices of Books.

A Dissertation on Native Depravity. By Gardiner Spring, D. D. 97
A Discourse on Education. Delivered before the Legislature of the State of Indiana. By Andrew Wylie, D. D. . . . 101

Page.

Farewell Sermon. By Rev. Wells Bushnell, [late Pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Meadville, Penn.] 103
An Essay on Demoniacs. By Plain Truth 107

Correspondence and Intelligence.

Extract from a Letter to one of the Editors 108
The Unitarian Church in Meadville, Penn. 109
Unitarianism in Detroit . . . 110
Association 110

CAMBRIDGE:
JAMES MUNROE AND COMPANY.
BOSTON:
RUSSELL, ODIORNE, AND METCALF.
1834.

Under sixteen 3 1-2 cents — Postage, under 100 miles, 3 3-4 cents — over 100 miles, 6 1-4 cents.

The Unitarian is issued in monthly numbers, by James Munroe and Co., *Cambridge, Mass.* Each number will contain, on an average, 48 pages royal 12mo., [i. e. octavo size], and be printed on good paper and with handsome type. The price will be two dollars per annum, payable on the first of March. To those who procure six subscribers a seventh copy will be furnished *gratis*. The usual discount to Agents. All letters and communications to be addressed to the publishers.

Our general list of Agents will be published as soon as it can be completed.

It will be perceived that both in the last and the present numbers an extra quantity of matter has been presented. We wish it to be understood, however, that we do not pledge ourselves to furnish more than 48 pages on an average, since the exceedingly low price at which our work is put will not authorize the giving of anything beyond the number stipulated in the prospectus.

It is our intention to notice all the books and pamphlets which we may receive so far as they fall within the plan of our work. We would, therefore, respectfully request authors and publishers to forward to us copies of such publications.

The Editors will hold themselves responsible for no articles except their own.

JAMES MUNROE AND CO.,

Booksellers to the University,

are Publishers of the following works:—

Apocrypha, 8vo.
Butler's Works, 2 vols.
——— Analogy.
Bowring's Matins and Vespers.
Cicero's Complete Works. 20 vols.
Cummings's New Testament.
——— Questions on the Gospels.
Economy of Human Life.
Griesbach's Greek Testament.
Hildreth's Lives of the Apostles.
Hartley's Prayers.
Holmes's American Annals.
Locke on St. Paul's Epistles.
Memoirs of Oberlin, with an Introductory Essay by Rev. Henry Ware, Jr.
Norton's Statement of Reasons for not believing the Doctrines of Trinitarians.
Noyes's Job.
Paley's Complete Works, 6 vols.
——— Natural Theology, with Paxton's Illustrations.
Peirce's History of Harvard College.
Robert Robinson's Sermons.
Selections from the Scriptures.
Theological Common-Place Book.
The Complete Works of Dugald Stewart, 7 vols.
Tucker's Light of Nature, 4 vols.
Worcester on the Atonement.
——— Friendly Review.
——— Last Thoughts on Important Subjects.
Whately's Rhetoric.
Whitman's Letters to a Universalist.
Ware on the Formation of the Christian Character.
Watson's Apology for the Bible.
Ware's Sunday Library.
Vol. 1, containing The Life of the Saviour, by Rev. Henry Ware, Jr.
Vol. 2, containing The Life of Howard the Philanthropist, by Mrs. John Farrar.

James Munroe & Co. have for sale the following Theological Works:—

Jeremy Taylor's Complete Works.
Barrow's Works.
Sherlock's, do.
Hall's do.
Barber's do.
Lightfoot's do.
Leslie's do.
Doddridge's do.
Paley's do.
Priestley's do.
Price's Works.
Leighton's do.
Horsley's do.
Porson's do.
Tillotson's do.
Wise's do.
Chalmers's do.
Tomline's do.
Bennet's do.
Stanhope's do.

THE UNITARIAN.

VOL. I. FEBRUARY 1, 1834. No. 2.

Christianity and Reform.

[Continued from p. 39.]

In a former article, we attempted to show that no real reform in man's moral or social condition can be effected by infidelity. — We now proceed to the consideration of our second point, namely, that the spirit of reform is in fact the very spirit of the gospel. This proposition may require some proof. Every body may not perceive, at first sight, the identity of the spirit of the gospel with that spirit which now agitates "the millions." There are those who look only on the surface of things, and never have any notion of what lies at the bottom; let such as these suspend their judgment, till they have examined and collected facts to make their judgment worthy of attention.

The spirit which lies at the bottom of the movements among the people is the spirit of reform, of progress. It may seem to the superficial observer only the spirit of insubordination, of restlessness, of unnecessary, if not criminal, agitation. But discontent, insubordination, destructive as either may be, should not be condemned. Man is a progressive being. His uneasiness at his present condition is the result of an internal consciousness, — vaguely defined, poorly understood, perhaps, — that he is susceptible of something better. He has an inward thirst for perfection. The millions now feel the workings of this desire, this craving for a more perfect moral and social condition. They are conscious of wants which the present state of things cannot satisfy. They de-

only suitable arguments to be urged against him. "The evils of society," we are gravely told, "always have existed, and always must exist. Man has always preyed upon man, and always will do so. It is in human nature to do so, and he but betrays his ignorance who dreams of a change." Perhaps so. Those who say so are doubtless wise men, men who are well acquainted with human nature in its diseased, if not in its healthy, manifestations. And yet, there is a singular inconsistency in these very wise men. They deny that the mass of mankind can possibly become virtuous; but point them to any particular individual of that mass, and they will admit, that that individual may, if he will, become a high-toned moral being. They thus deny of the whole, what they admit to be true of all its parts, and of parts, too, which are very much alike. For all men have, substantially, the same nature; all have within themselves all the elements of thought, of reason, of virtue. The greatest and best have nothing of which the least and worst have not the germs. And there is not an individual in whom those germs cannot be warmed into life and expanded into a generous virtue. Every man is commanded to love God with all his heart, soul, and strength, and his neighbour as himself. Single out one that cannot do this. Cannot *you* thus love God and man? Cannot your neighbour? his neighbour? and his? Where is there one who cannot? Nowhere? Then all can comply with the requisitions of the gospel. Each individual can reform, can improve, can attain a high moral standing. If each individual can, all can; and, of course, the great mass of mankind can become virtuous.

Should every individual become virtuous, acquire that purity of heart, that firmness of purpose, that love to God and to man, which the gospel demands, that moral growth which Jesus laboured to produce, there could remain no institutions of an evil tendency. All that now bears man down to the dust and darkens his soul would be removed, all social as well as all private evils would disappear, and all governments would be so remodelled, as to have no longer a deteriorating influence. Bad governments, mischievous social institutions, are not to be attributed to the defects of rulers, to their ignorance, to their vices, nor to their crimes, but to the people. No people, worthy of freedom, was ever enslaved. When the majority of a community are really free in themselves, have pure and just principles, firm and manly characters, no tyrant can enslave that community, no mischievous government can

pure, useful, generous, and noble in character; and was it not expressly designed to impart the inward power needed to gain it? Is not here the spirit of reform, of a radical reform?

But this reform is not the production of a moment. It must be gradual, a progress, a growth. The gospel commands us to improve in knowledge and virtue, to "grow in grace," "to press onward and upward towards the mark of our high calling," "to become perfect as our Father in heaven is perfect." It is not with one degree of holiness, not with one step forward in the eternal career of moral progress, that the gospel is satisfied. It is the highest degree, the step farthest in advance possible, that it demands. It has no smile for mediocrity, no indulgence for the indolent. Its look is forward, and if it sometimes permits one to survey the ground over which he has passed, it is not that he may applaud himself for the progress already made, but that he may gather fresh courage and hope for the journey which still lies before. Is not here the spirit of progress, the spirit urging on to perfection?

Nor is it to one individual alone that the gospel appeals, not one alone it would quicken and urge onward in a glorious career of improvement. It appeals to all. What it demands of one individual it demands of every individual. It acknowledges no man's right to be a sinner — declares that no man can be exempt from the law of duty — declares, in terms not to be misinterpreted, to the high and the low, to the rich and the poor, to the bond and the free, that no one has the consent of his Maker to do that which is wrong, or to neglect that which is right. The spirit of the gospel, then, requires a universal reform; it requires every individual to advance, to grow in grace, to press on towards perfection; and does not this identify it, in reality, with the stirring spirit of the times? with the spirit — not of the stationary — but of the movement party?

Does the gospel demand that which is impracticable? Does it demand this extensive, this radical reform, without permitting us to hope that it can be realized? So, indeed, it would seem, from the language of its professed friends. Even religious men brand him who proposes such a reform, a disturber of the peace, call him a disorganizer, and enough of other epithets of reproach. He who ventures to predict that it will be realized, is pronounced a visionary, and people propose a strait jacket, or physic and good regimen, as the

only suitable arguments to be urged against him. "The evils of society," we are gravely told, "always have existed, and always must exist. Man has always preyed upon man, and always will do so. It is in human nature to do so, and he but betrays his ignorance who dreams of a change." Perhaps so. Those who say so are doubtless wise men, men who are well acquainted with human nature in its diseased, if not in its healthy, manifestations. And yet, there is a singular inconsistency in these very wise men. They deny that the mass of mankind can possibly become virtuous; but point them to any particular individual of that mass, and they will admit, that that individual may, if he will, become a high-toned moral being. They thus deny of the whole, what they admit to be true of all its parts, and of parts, too, which are very much alike. For all men have, substantially, the same nature; all have within themselves all the elements of thought, of reason, of virtue. The greatest and best have nothing of which the least and worst have not the germs. And there is not an individual in whom those germs cannot be warmed into life and expanded into a generous virtue. Every man is commanded to love God with all his heart, soul, and strength, and his neighbour as himself. Single out one that cannot do this. Cannot *you* thus love God and man? Cannot your neighbour? his neighbour? and his? Where is there one who cannot? Nowhere? Then all can comply with the requisitions of the gospel. Each individual can reform, can improve, can attain a high moral standing. If each individual can, all can; and, of course, the great mass of mankind can become virtuous.

Should every individual become virtuous, acquire that purity of heart, that firmness of purpose, that love to God and to man, which the gospel demands, that moral growth which Jesus laboured to produce, there could remain no institutions of an evil tendency. All that now bears man down to the dust and darkens his soul would be removed, all social as well as all private evils would disappear, and all governments would be so remodelled, as to have no longer a deteriorating influence. Bad governments, mischievous social institutions, are not to be attributed to the desires of rulers, to their ignorance, to their vice, nor to their crimes, but to the people. No people, much or little, was ever enslaved. When the majority of a community are really true to themselves, have pure and low principles, firm and manly characters, no tyrant can enslave that community, no mischievous government can

possibly be established over it. Whatever political evils there may be in any community, they must disappear in the exact proportion that the growth of individual virtue demands. Make all men good Christians, — and all can and should be, — all governments would become free, all social institutions beneficial, and man's intercourse with man, harmonious, pleasing, endearing.

That Jesus came to introduce a new order of things, to change, to perfect, man's moral and social institutions has indeed been admitted by some, but so timidly, with such coldness of assent, that the admission has led to little vigorous and well sustained exertion. The great mass of the friends as well as the opponents of the gospel have had but a slight glimpse of this truth. They have said, and still say, that such could not have been his object, because he has not yet accomplished it. But we have seen too many things effected during the last hundred years, which former generations would have pronounced impossible, to regard with much attention the reasoning that would measure the future by the past, that would infer that because a thing has not been it therefore cannot be. The work which Jesus proposed is not, indeed, yet accomplished. That work was immense. The gospel found the human race with false ideas of morality and religion, with mischievous governments, and institutions almost universally opposed to the interests of society. The prevalent modes of feeling, thinking, and acting were wrong. Things were valued in an inverse ratio to their real worth. Fame was obtained, not by real virtue, — not by the preservation, but by the destruction, of human life. War was the business and the glory of governments and rulers. The useful arts were menial, and were assigned to those who had, and could have, no share in what were esteemed honourable pursuits. The worship of God was an outward service, an observance of impure or debasing rites and ceremonies, performed, not at the command of conscience, but of the state or the priesthood. Now all this was to be changed. For the pompous was to be substituted the simple, — for the external, the internal. The mere member of the state or of a sacerdotal corporation was to be converted into an individual, with rights, duties, responsibilities of his own. The useless was to give place to the useful, war to peace, the destruction of human life to its preservation, the false estimate of things to the true; and nothing was to be valued except in proportion to its power to add something to the well-being of man; nothing was to be accounted virtue which might not

do something to develope the spiritual nature, to make man a more elevated moral being, a more pious worshipper of God, a warmer or steadier friend to his race. This was not the work of a day. Without converting man into a different order of being, it could be done only gradually; and because it is not yet completed, shall we rashly say it was never designed?

One great reason why Jesus has not effected more may be found in the contracted notions which have been entertained of his design. Of those who heard him most gladly, few comprehended his object. The ignorant multitude of that day did not and could not comprehend it. It far exceeded their stage of mental progress, to take in the idea of a reform so extensive and so radical as he proposed. They were incapable of understanding that it was an entire new order of things which he wished to effect. They degraded him in their minds, from the dignity of a moral regenerator of the world, to the littleness of a theological disputant. They supposed he had come to change a few items of religious belief, to alter or abolish a few of the forms of religious worship, — that he had come merely to mend with a piece of new cloth a few of the rents in the old worn-out garment of the social and moral system; but they never imagined, notwithstanding they were so informed, that the new would tear away from the old, and the rent thus be made worse, and that the only rational way of proceeding was to throw off the old, and to put on an entire new garment. Consequently, though Christ was nominally preached, for a long series of years his power was scarcely felt, and the great object of his mission was unperceived. People (to borrow, with a slight variation, another scriptural illustration,) people "called themselves by the name" of Christ "to take away their reproach"; but they were "content to eat their own bread and wear their own apparel" — they would fain be known by his name, but in regard to anything beyond this, to any change of life consequent thereupon, they cared not, they thought not. That he had power to touch the heart, — power to quicken the soul, to give it the very life of virtue, — power to change the whole face of the moral and political world, was not dreamed of in the philosophy which, for centuries, usurped the schools and the churches.

Still, the spirit of Christ was in the world. Though the darkness of men's minds and hearts prevented it from being perceived, it was silently, gradually, effecting its work. It touched a heart, here and there. It kindled up the ethereal

fire, now in this mind, now in that. It formed, here and there, little nucleï, around which began to gravitate the immortal atoms of a new moral world, pure and lovely in the sight of God and man. If its power was suspended in this place, repressed in this community, it burst forth with additional energy and glory in that. Meanwhile the world is agitated. Revolutions are daily occurring. All is in commotion. All is in a transition state, although to the spectator all seems settled. Letters revive. Science begins to shed its light. Young thought begins to feel its strength, and to be ambitious of trying its wing. The past is recalled; the present is surveyed. Man sees himself in a new light. Views of his wrongs and sufferings, of his wants and capabilities, are taken from more favourable positions. Governments, religions, social institutions, in general, are summoned to the bar of infant reason. Speculation rushes into the future, and dares picture forth worlds of ideal beauty and felicity for the human race. Practical spirits appear, and resolve to embody what others behold in idea. Now the Son of God comes with power and glory. Now his Spirit, which has so long been trampled upon, which has so long been struggling in secret, looks forth upon the world, and rolls back the clouds of mental and moral darkness. And there is a swelling of men's hearts; and there is hope stretching forth her arms, eager to grasp that greater good which the soul has beheld in vision. Mind redoubles its strength. The individual man now feels, almost for the first time, that he is not a mere cipher, nothing worth only as he is annexed to the state or the crowd, — but that he is a man, with rights and prerogatives. The human race begins its upward and onward career in moral and social improvement. — We call this the epoch of THE REFORMATION. It is that epoch when the power of Rome was shaken, and the human mind was reconquered from her despotism. And the philosophical spectator might have then discerned at work all the causes which are to effect the mightiest revolutions, and to secure results inexpressibly grand and glorious for the whole human race. The gospel works silently, but effectually. At times it may seem suppressed, and fearful souls may imagine the world abandoned to wretchedness and despair. But all this time of darkness and doubt, it is collecting its power for new and more astonishing victories. The gospel was compared to "leaven concealed in three measures of meal;" though concealed its power was not destroyed. In what we now see, in these agitations, these new parties, these

new demands throughout the world, we should recognise its slow but energetic workings to "leaven the whole lump." The gospel is the power of God unto salvation. The mass now feel it struggling within them, and bear witness to its reforming energy; and we may "thank God and take courage." The time draws nigh when it will not be alleged that Christ did not propose to reform the world, because he has not yet done it.

Indeed, if all the glowing and majestic descriptions of the Messiah's reign be not so many rhetorical flourishes, changes of almost inconceivable magnitude are yet to be effected in man's moral and social condition. It was a glorious morning that which dawned on the birth of Jesus. If all Scripture be not a deceptive dream, then commenced a new age, that happy order of things which had been so often predicted, so rapturously sung by inspired bards, and so long desired by all nations. Then the Angel of Improvement hovered with joy over the earth, and saw with rapture, as he looked down the stream of time, the all-comprehensive principles then introduced, gradually, but effectually, working their way through all opposition, subduing all enemies, surmounting every obstacle, and finally regenerating the whole moral world. He saw wrongs and outrages disappearing,—ignorance, vice, and crime yielding up their empire,—man rising from the oppressions of a hundred ages, and looking forth, the image of his Maker, upon a world of beauty. He heard the last note of discord die away in the distance, the tear which the mother shed for her son slain in battle was wiped from her eye,—the sigh which bespoke unrequited affection was suppressed,—man everywhere opened his heart and gave his hand to his brother. He beheld; and gave the shout of joy, which rung back from heaven's hosts: "Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace and good will towards men."—The vision of the Angel shall be realized. Man shall yet be worthy of his origin, and be able to rejoice in his destiny.

O. A. Brownson.

Pauperism.

It was customary, as we all know, among the Romans, to make annual donations of corn to the poor; and, in the times of the emperors more especially, immense sums were expended in this way. The evil, however, increased with the supply. The people acquired the habit of depending upon government for support, and, in the same proportion, neglected to provide for themselves.

The system of poor-laws in England, after various modifications, was finally established in 1601, with the same general features by which it has ever since been characterized. Its great objects are: —

1. "Setting the children of the poor to work, when their parents cannot maintain them;
2. "Putting poor children out as apprentices;
3. "Setting the idle to work;
4. "Providing for the support of the old, lame, blind, and such as are unable to work, from infancy or other causes, and to pay for raw materials."

In theory nothing could seem more wise and humane, and we may well doubt whether any laws for the same purpose could be more judiciously framed. How have they operated?

The first assessment (1601) was £200,000, and from that time to this the sum has been gradually increasing. Not that in each year it has been greater than in the preceding year; for, in consequence of a great dearth, in 1801 the assessment was greater than at any former or subsequent time, and amounted to £10,000,000. Still, the poor-rates have been a constantly increasing burden, and now annually amount to about £7,000,000, or *thirty millions of dollars*. In 1833 they were rather more than £8,000,000.

In 1803, according to Mr. Colquhoun, one ninth of the whole community existed, as paupers, vagabonds, and criminal offenders, at the expense of about one third of the remaining population; and since that period the increase both of crime and pauperism has more than kept pace with the increase of inhabitants. The law, therefore, has proved wholly inadequate. It has neither removed poverty, nor diminished it. The sum originally thought sufficient, though thrice, nay, twenty times told, would do little towards removing the wants which are now left untouched.

Again, look at Scotland. In 1700 the poor, in all but

three parishes, were supported by voluntary contributions. These three parishes were in the vicinity of England, and were subject to legal assessments. The evil gradually advanced towards the north, and in 1819 one half the population of the kingdom were assessed for the benefit of the poor. The disease gathered strength as it advanced. The increase of pauperism between 1800 and 1819 was absolutely greater than the whole increase during the preceding century. Not only was the number of parishes liable to assessment increased, but the amount assessed in many parishes was doubled in ten years.

The uniform experience of our own country has been similar. Of the population of New Hampshire in 1800, one in 333 was a pauper; twenty years afterwards, one in 100 was a pauper, and the expense had increased from $17,000 to $80,000.

In Massachusetts, according to Mr. Quincy's report, about one sixty-seventh of the whole population were paupers in 1821; but, if we may rely upon the report made to the legislature last winter, no less than one fortieth (or, including individuals who were assisted out of the workhouses, one thirtieth) of the inhabitants of towns which have workhouses are paupers. In small country-towns the average would be considerably less. But, after all the deductions we can make, it must be allowed that one forty-fifth of our population depend more or less upon public charity for support. The state's poor in 1800 cost $28,000, and in 1821, $72,000, — an increase greater than has ever taken place in England during any twenty years since the reign of Elizabeth.

In New York and Pennsylvania the result has been the same. And why should it not be so? Why should not pauperism, like every other profession, thrive under encouragement? Offer a large bounty to any particular trade, and immediately its ranks will be crowded. The poor-laws say that if any man will not support himself or his family, the state shall support them. What is there, then, to prevent the land from swarming with paupers? Fortunately, the profession here is not yet an honourable one. Men, generally, have an impression that it is better to earn their own bread than to depend upon the public bounty. But these squeamish feelings are gradually disappearing. There are already many who are prevented by no false delicacy from demanding, as their *right*, a support from the hands of their country; and the longer the present laws continue, unless great pains be used to counteract

their bad influence, the less will be the common repugnance to taking advantage of them. But to be more specific.

1. In the first place, poor-laws, as they have generally existed, encourage improvidence and idleness. There always will be, in every community, many, whom nothing but absolute want will drive to labour, and whom nothing but the near prospect of absolute want will induce to make provision for the future. It is easy to see how the poor-laws affect such men. "What is the use of wearing myself out," is the natural expression of the tired labourer, "for the purpose of gaining a living? or why should I submit to such deprivations for the purpose of laying up anything? At the worst, we shall only come upon the town."

There is, in the human breast, a spirit which disdains dependence; and, on account of this spirit, it is believed that few, except the really degraded among us, have been influenced by considerations like those we have just mentioned. This independent spirit it is above all things our duty to cherish. The pain of hunger and want, — starvation itself, — is an inconsiderable evil, in the eyes of the philanthropist, when compared with the base and grovelling passions, the beastly desires, the worse than reptile meanness, of a servile mind. Yet, has it not been the direct tendency of poor-laws, to cherish this dependent character among the indigent? The more common workhouses become, the less will they be dreaded. The honest and industrious, who at first could not endure them, will at length feel that they are not the worst things in the world; that a place there, is not, perhaps, *very* disreputable; and, finally, that it is better than the continual labour and anxiety which they must undergo, if they hold themselves responsible for the support of their families. It is but availing themselves of the provision which has been made for them; it is but taking advantage of what they have a right to. Their exertions, therefore, are remitted; and, by and by, they become pensioners upon the public charity.

It is not poverty, as has been well said, but pauperism, that we should dread as a pest. The poor man, who divides with his family the scanty proceeds of his daily labour, is sustained, amid all his sufferings and privations, by the reflection that he rests upon himself for support. Discouragements may oppress his soul, and, at times, almost grind him to the earth. But the consciousness that what he has is his own, that his food and raiment are the product of his own

exertions, and that, poor and humble as he is, his family look to him with grateful hearts for even the coarse fare that he is able to supply, is enough to sanctify his afflictions, and to make the hardest toil a teacher of the highest virtues that adorn our nature. The struggles of want provide a happy discipline of character. They are the severe but prolific parents of virtue. Numerous and heavy, therefore, as the poor man's sufferings may be, we could not, without painful reluctance, see them removed by the comfortable provisions of public charity. Admitting that bodily suffering could in this way be alleviated, the partial good would bear no comparison with the moral evils that would ensue.

2. We would observe, in the second place, that our poor-laws hold out a direct encouragement to vice. Of the 1,040,716 who were paupers in England, in 1803, three quarters were *culpable* paupers; and the condition of this part of the English population has not been improving since that time. "Of 499 inmates of the House of Industry, in Boston, when it was visited by the agent of the commissioners" (last winter), says Dr. Tuckerman, "three fourths, excluding idiots and the insane, were said to have been brought there by intemperance. Of 3000 who have been admitted to the Salem workhouse, during the ten years in which it has been in the care of its present superintendent, he thinks that 2,900 were brought there, directly or indirectly, by intemperance." So in Marblehead, Cambridge, Charlestown, and in almost every town in the commonwealth, where the statistics of the poor have been taken. So, also, throughout the state of New York. In some counties more than one half, in some two thirds, and in others three fourths of the paupers, became so through intemperance. In the city of New York, January 1833, says the superintendent of the workhouse, "The number of male adults is 572; of whom not ten can be called sober men. The number of female adults is 601, and I doubt whether fifty of them can be called sober women." But intemperance is only one of the vices which lead to pauperism; and, bearing this in mind, it is not, perhaps, extravagant to say, that, excluding idiots and the insane, nine tenths of the adult paupers in this country became so in consequence of their vicious habits.

How are poor-laws, we would ask, to prevent this vice and the poverty consequent upon it? Is it reasonable to suppose that they will do it by crying out, as in fact they do, to the incipient drunkard, or to the man beset by temp-

tation, "Go on in your debauchery; we will take care of your family while you are thus engaged; when your health is injured, we will furnish you with a hospital until it be restored; and when your constitution is broken down, come to us, we will give you an asylum in which the remnant of your days may be spent in peace and plenteousness?"* Is this the way to prevent vice? or do we not rather hold out to it, thus, a direct encouragement?

The argument, however, is met with much plausibility by the assertion that men sin from weakness and not from calculation; that no one becomes a profligate or a drunkard because sure of an asylum for himself or his family in a poor-house. — Will this reasoning stand? Government, let us suppose, offers a direct bounty to all who will engage in a particular species of licentiousness. The law will do no harm, our objectors say. Men become licentious from weakness, and not from calculation. Hence the most licentious government that could be established would not demoralize the people. Can anyone admit this? We allow that men seldom become vicious from calculation. But are there not many standing upon the verge of dissipation, who would fall headlong into the gulf, were the restraints by which they are now held back at all weakened? Are none deterred from the first act of vice by the thought of the consequences to their families? May not their virtuous resolutions be weakened or strengthened by public laws? When it once becomes fashionable (and it is every day becoming so) for the poor to apply to the public and depend upon the public for support, a powerful stimulus to patient labour, and the virtues of industry, sobriety, and economy, will be removed, and the work of corruption will gain strength at every step. This is the way in which bad laws always operate. No community is corrupted by them at once. In bodies politic, as in physi-

* An article in *The Spirit of the Age*, of January 9, contains the following statements: — "The number of men in the House of Industry [in Boston], on the 1st inst., was 236; women, 162; boys, 89; girls, 80; total, 537 [567?]. In the House of Correction were 74 males and 49 females; total, 123. In the House of Reformation, 61 boys and 18 girls; total, 79. Grand total, 739 [769?]. The first named of the above establishments is supported at an annual expense of over $23,000; the second, near $11,000; the third, between $6,000 and $7,000. On the strength of the thoroughly settled fact that at least *three fourths* of the pauperism among us is owing to intemperance, it appears that the citizens of this enlightened emporium — the seat of good morals and the Athens of America — are paying something over $30,000 a year for the whole maintenance of between five and six hundred drunken paupers."

only suitable arguments to be urged against him. "The evils of society," we are gravely told, "always have existed, and always must exist. Man has always preyed upon man, and always will do so. It is in human nature to do so, and he but betrays his ignorance who dreams of a change." Perhaps so. Those who say so are doubtless wise men, men who are well acquainted with human nature in its diseased, if not in its healthy, manifestations. And yet, there is a singular inconsistency in these very wise men. They deny that the mass of mankind can possibly become virtuous; but point them to any particular individual of that mass, and they will admit, that that individual may, if he will, become a high-toned moral being. They thus deny of the whole, what they admit to be true of all its parts, and of parts, too, which are very much alike. For all men have, substantially, the same nature; all have within themselves all the elements of thought, of reason, of virtue. The greatest and best have nothing of which the least and worst have not the germs. And there is not an individual in whom those germs cannot be warmed into life and expanded into a generous virtue. Every man is commanded to love God with all his heart, soul, and strength, and his neighbour as himself. Single out one that cannot do this. Cannot *you* thus love God and man? Cannot your neighbour? his neighbour? and his? Where is there one who cannot? Nowhere? Then all can comply with the requisitions of the gospel. Each individual can reform, can improve, can attain a high moral standing. If each individual can, all can; and, of course, the great mass of mankind can become virtuous.

Should every individual become virtuous, acquire that purity of heart, that firmness of purpose, that love to God and to man, which the gospel demands, that moral growth which Jesus laboured to produce, there could remain no institutions of an evil tendency. All that now bears man down to the dust and darkens his soul would be removed, all social as well as all private evils would disappear, and all governments would be so remodelled, as to have no longer a deteriorating influence. Bad governments, mischievous social institutions, are not to be attributed to the defects of rulers, to their ignorance, to their vices, nor to their crimes, but to the people. No people, worthy of freedom, was ever enslaved. When the majority of a community are really free in themselves, have pure and just principles, firm and manly characters, no tyrant can enslave that community, no mischievous government can

possibly be established over it. Whatever political evils there may be in any community, they must disappear in the exact proportion that the growth of individual virtue demands. Make all men good Christians, — and all can and should be, — all governments would become free, all social institutions beneficial, and man's intercourse with man, harmonious, pleasing, endearing.

That Jesus came to introduce a new order of things, to change, to perfect, man's moral and social institutions has indeed been admitted by some, but so timidly, with such coldness of assent, that the admission has led to little vigorous and well sustained exertion. The great mass of the friends as well as the opponents of the gospel have had but a slight glimpse of this truth. They have said, and still say, that such could not have been his object, because he has not yet accomplished it. But we have seen too many things effected during the last hundred years, which former generations would have pronounced impossible, to regard with much attention the reasoning that would measure the future by the past, that would infer that because a thing has not been it therefore cannot be. The work which Jesus proposed is not, indeed, yet accomplished. That work was immense. The gospel found the human race with false ideas of morality and religion, with mischievous governments, and institutions almost universally opposed to the interests of society. The prevalent modes of feeling, thinking, and acting were wrong. Things were valued in an inverse ratio to their real worth. Fame was obtained, not by real virtue, — not by the preservation, but by the destruction, of human life. War was the business and the glory of governments and rulers. The useful arts were menial, and were assigned to those who had, and could have, no share in what were esteemed honourable pursuits. The worship of God was an outward service, an observance of impure or debasing rites and ceremonies, performed, not at the command of conscience, but of the state or the priesthood. Now all this was to be changed. For the pompous was to be substituted the simple, — for the external, the internal. The mere member of the state or of a sacerdotal corporation was to be converted into an individual, with rights, duties, responsibilities of his own. The useless was to give place to the useful, war to peace, the destruction of human life to its preservation, the false estimate of things to the true; and nothing was to be valued except in proportion to its power to add something to the well-being of man; nothing was to be accounted virtue which might not

becoming every year more and more an object of importance. Our political institutions, our schools, and, above all, our moral and religious habits, may prevent them from ever acquiring the influence here which they have had in England. Still, we should look to them betimes. It will not do to rely too much upon present impunity. We, above all men, should avoid a temporizing policy. We must remember our duty now, in the days of our youth. Upon some subjects the consequences of our bad legislation will extend to distant ages. Slavery, if attended to in season, might have been easily abolished. We temporized; and what can now be done? Pauperism, as yet, is a small evil. But if it goes on for two centuries more, with anything like the same increasing ratio which has marked its progress for the last thirty years, what shall we do? We shall be brought to that unhappy state, so despondingly described by the historian of falling Rome, when we can neither endure our diseases, nor the violent remedies from which alone recovery can be hoped.

But what shall be done to avert the evil? Shall poor-laws be altogether repealed? We are not prepared to advocate this measure, though sure that many important amendments might easily be made. Most of the ill effects that have attended pauper-laws are to be attributed more to mismanagement and carelessness than to the laws themselves. All such laws are peculiarly liable to abuse. They therefore require uncommon attention both from rulers and people. But if the public mind is kept awake to the subject, ready to detect errors and abuses before they gain a firm hold, a great proportion of the evils which we have pointed out may be avoided. With this severe and watchful scrutiny on the part of the public, bad laws are harmless; without it, good laws are pernicious. It is not from a vain hope to influence legislative decisions that we have thrown out these suggestions, nor from a love of fault-finding; but in order that we might do the little that was in our power to draw the public attention to a subject, which has not yet received from the community the attention that its importance demands.

J. H. Morison.

Letters to Trinitarians and Calvinists.

No. II.

THE UNITY.

CHRISTIAN BRETHREN,

IN my last communication I stated six reasons for rejecting the doctrine of the Trinity. You will now wish to know the Unitarian belief respecting the nature of God. I answer for myself. I believe God is One; one Being, one Spirit, one Mind. I believe he is one Person, as clearly, as strictly, as entirely, as I am one person. I believe there is no division in his nature, either into persons, or distinctions, or modes, or "somewhats." I believe the Parent of the universe, the God and Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, our heavenly Father, to be the one true God. This I believe for many weighty reasons; six of the most common I will briefly illustrate.

1. In the first place, I believe that our heavenly Father is the only true God, because this doctrine alone is sanctioned by reason and nature. How do you prove the existence of God? you appeal to the works of creation. You take a minute survey of the earth; you extend your view to the celestial bodies; you look into yourselves; and in all these you discover numberless marks of contrivance and design and skill. You affirm that these demonstrate the being and agency of an infinitely powerful, intelligent, benevolent Contriver, Designer, Artificer, Parent. This infinite Spirit you call GOD. But in order to make your argument perfect and conclusive, you contend that there is a singleness of contrivance, a unity of design, a oneness in the execution of all the works of nature. Consequently, your argument proves most satisfactorily that there is but one will, one individual mind, in the Godhead. This proof is just as strong in favour of the simple unity of God as it is for his existence. And if you give up this evidence which fully establishes the divine unity, you part with the only convincing proof of his being and perfections. I have not room to enlarge. You can examine this point at your leisure. Is it not better to renounce the doctrine of the Trinity, than to sacrifice your only evidence for the existence of a supreme Creator and Father?

2. In the second place, I believe that our heavenly Father is the only true God, because I find this doctrine clearly and distinctly and repeatedly taught in the Old Testament. When the Father of the Faithful was called from idolatry, he received some knowledge of the nature of the Deity. This information was afterwards confirmed to his descendants. What was then the first great command of Jehovah? "Thou shalt have no other Gods before *me*," that is, "besides me," or, which is the same thing, "in my presence;" for even Trinitarian commentators acknowledge that this is the meaning of the Hebrew. The word *me*, as you well know, can mean but one person. If, then, you render supreme worship to other beings besides the Giver of this injunction, do you not violate the first article in the decalogue? In what words was this doctrine repeated? "Hear, O Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord." What were the divine declarations by Isaiah? Listen to three of the most striking. "Is there a God besides me? Yea, there is no God; I know not any." The words *I* and *me* must surely belong to one person. "Look unto me and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else." The same remark applies to this passage as to the other. "Remember the former things of old; for I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me." Is it possible to mistake the meaning of such explicit statements? Take another specimen, from Hosea. "I am God and not man; the holy *One* in the midst of thee." Now if these expressions, so direct and unqualified, do not prove the simple unity of God, I know of no language which can. These are but a few specimens of the general tenor of the Old Testament; and accordingly, I must believe that our heavenly Father is the only true God. I beseech you to examine the Hebrew Scriptures for yourselves, and if you arrive at the same conclusion, I hope you will declare your convictions to the world and risk all consequences. — *Exodus*, xx. 3. *Deut.* vi. 4. *Isaiah*, xliv. 8. xlv. 22. xlvi. 9. *Hosea*, xi. 9.

3. In the third place, I believe that our heavenly Father is the only true God, because this doctrine has been uniformly received by the Jewish nation. In ancient and in modern times, this has been their distinction. Whether among idolaters or Trinitarians, they have unhesitatingly declared their belief in the simple unity of the Deity. Wherever scattered, however persecuted, they have regularly offered their devotions to the holy *One*. Now is it possible that they have

always misunderstood the meaning of their own prophets, their own Scriptures? Or if such a supposition be possible, how does it happen that they have always been so harmonious on this point, and that no controversy should ever have arisen among them respecting it? This uniform belief of the Jews in the simple unity of God is, to my mind, conclusive evidence that this, and this alone, is the doctrine of their Scriptures.

4. In the fourth place, I believe that our heavenly Father is the only true God, because I find this doctrine plainly and distinctly and repeatedly declared in the New Testament. Jesus was sent to bear witness to the truth. What was his testimony on this question? On a very memorable occasion he uses these remarkable words: "Father, ... this is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." You will notice that the word *Father* can mean but one person. You will also remember that the pronoun *thee* can refer but to one individual. You will likewise observe that Jesus himself pronounces *this Father* to be the ONLY *true* God. He expressly distinguishes between his Father, the Sender, and himself, the Sent. Now if this Father was the *only* true God, then surely the person who made this declaration cannot be included in the Godhead. A more striking expression of the doctrine of the divine unity cannot be produced from any Unitarian author. But just reverse the case. Suppose our Lord had said, "This is life eternal, to know thee, the Father, the Son, and the Spirit, the only true God." Would there ever have been any dispute respecting the nature of Deity? Certainly not. Why, then, should anyone contend against the most explicit declarations of our Saviour? But there are other passages equally plain and conclusive. Take one of the number. "But unto us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord, Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him." Can words more clearly teach the doctrine of the divine unity? — Such is a mere specimen of the current language of the Christian Scriptures. Read for yourselves; and if you are convinced that Jesus and his apostles firmly believed and uniformly taught that our heavenly Father is the only true God, I hope you will receive this as the doctrine of inspiration. — *John.* xvii. 3. 1 *Cor.* viii. 6.

5. In the fifth place, I believe that our heavenly Father is the only true God, because this doctrine was believed by

the early Christians, for many generations after our Saviour's crucifixion. In proof of this statement I appeal with perfect confidence to ecclesiastical history. I have not room for many quotations, but I will present you with one or two from the learned Trinitarian, Mosheim. In relation to the belief of the second century he furnishes the following facts: "The whole Christian system was still comprised in a few precepts and propositions; nor did the teachers publicly advance any doctrines besides those contained in what is called the *Apostles' Creed.* In their manner of handling these doctrines, there was nothing subtile, profound, or distant from common apprehension." How striking the difference between the teachings of these simple-minded men and the jargon of Trinitarian mysticism! It seems, then, according to the concession of Mosheim himself, that during the first century nothing but pure Unitarianism was taught in the Christian churches. For examine the *Apostles' Creed,* and what hint do you find of the doctrine of the Trinity? "I believe in God, the Father almighty, Maker of heaven and earth; and in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord, who was conceived by the holy ghost, born of the virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried; he descended into hell; the third day he rose again from the dead; he ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God, the Father almighty; from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. I believe in the holy ghost, the holy catholic church, the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting." Let the most thorough Unitarian give a formulary of his faith, and in what one particular would it differ from this? — These quotations are sufficient to show you that the early Christians for many years did not believe the doctrine of the Trinity, but considered our heavenly Father the only true God. This conclusion is abundantly confirmed by all ecclesiastical historians of merit. But I would have you examine this point for yourselves, and decide according to the evidence presented. — *Murdock's Mosheim,* vol. i. p. 152. *Lord King's History of the Apostles' Creed,* pp. 47, 48. See also, *The Book of Common Prayer.*

6. Finally, I believe that our heavenly Father is the only true God, because this doctrine alone is adapted to the human understanding. I cannot believe that a Parent of infinite wisdom and goodness would make the fundamental article of his revelation wholly incomprehensible to his imperfect chil-

dren, and to many of them appear really contradictory to the clearest dictates of reason. I cannot imagine that he requires us to adopt a sentiment which is nowhere distinctly expressed in any one passage of the whole Bible. I cannot think that he would put an everlasting stumbling-block before the portals of his spiritual kingdom. I must conclude that if he revealed anything concerning his nature, this revelation would be adapted to our feeble capacities. Now the idea of one universal Father is intelligible to a child of the tenderest age, and on this account is the gospel adapted to the capacities and understandings and necessities of children. It is good news to all, and especially to those who have long wandered in the mazes of idolatry. No one can rationally object to the doctrine. It is retained by the living members of the Ancient Church; so far, then, is the way clear for them to embrace the gospel. It is already received by the followers of the False Prophet; and thus are they in a measure prepared to listen to the claims of Jesus and his divine religion. It is acknowledged by the company of deists, whom absurd dogmas have caused to reject all special revelation; and thus are they in a condition to be brought back to the fold of Christ. It is what the heathen need, and will readily embrace when it shall be properly presented. It is adapted to the human understanding and the human heart. As a disciple of the Saviour, as a friend of my race, I cling to this truth with unshaken confidence. I have tried both systems and I find this far the better faith by which to live. The doctrine of the Trinity gave me nothing but perplexity, uneasiness, dissatisfaction, doubt, and unhappiness. The doctrine of the unity of God gives me peace, and comfort, and joy. I believe it to be, also, the best doctrine by which to die; for I have known those, who had given it a fair trial, leave the world in triumph. But while I feel thus confident, I shall ever aim to manifest perfect charity towards all who reject this fundamental article of my Christian faith. Still, let me entreat you, before you conclude to reject it, to examine the Scriptures, and judge for yourselves as to what they really teach.

Thus, Christian brethren, you have my six reasons for believing that our heavenly Father is the only true God. I would remark, in conclusion, that I feel much more confident that my view of the nature of Deity is true, than you possibly can that yours is. For you cannot bring a single passage from the whole Bible which teaches or implies your article of faith. You can refer to but two verses which have any bear-

ing on the question in dispute. You cannot reconcile your human creed with the decisions of reason or the instructions of revelation. Now I find the doctrine of the divine unity distinctly taught in every part of the sacred writings; and this truth is amply confirmed by the dictates of the human understanding. Shall I, therefore, proceed to condemn you for embracing what I consider an irrational, unscriptural, injurious error? I have indeed a thousand times more apology for such a course than you can possibly have in relation to the condemnation of Unitarians. But no. The mischief does not consist in our differing so widely on this important topic. It consists in your unwillingness to grant us the same rights which you claim for yourselves. If you will show us the same charity which you actually need from us, we may live together in peace and harmony and love.

Respectfully,

B. Whitman.

Letters from the South. No. I.

New York, *Dec. 15th.* 1833.

Agreeably to my promise, I now sit down to put together a few of my notes. From so rapid a journey as mine you must not expect much. I will give you what I can. My stay in this city is necessarily very short; I shall leave to-morrow. But as I have made the best of my time, I trust that the remarks I may make on a few topics may not be altogether unacceptable to you.

I have just come from a very interesting conversation at ———'s, on the condition of the poor in this city — to which, of late, the public attention has been strongly arrested. I am told that very few can form any conception of the amount of poverty, dissoluteness, intemperance, and dishonesty, mutually acting on each other among the lower classes. — I may remark, by the way, that the under-population of the city is composed almost entirely of foreigners. Nearly all the objects of charity are of this class. It is rare that you find a very poor New-Englander. — Pauperism here, is not, indeed, what it is in Europe, yet it is a disorder sufficiently alarming. Street-begging, I believe, is almost unknown;

but solicitations at the doors of private houses are very frequent. Cases of all sorts of deception are nearly as numerous as the applications for relief and assistance. A friend has told me that, within his own experience, eight instances out of ten were of this kind; and his is not the only testimony I have received to the same point. Many of the abandoned are supported by sending out such children as they can lay their hands on, with fictitious stories of distress; soon teaching them the requisite arts of deception, in the use of which they speedily become adroit. Many of the more ingenious paupers are not behind their brethren over the sea in devising the semblance of bodily sufferings and deformities. Unfortunately, the amount of charity bestowed is equal to the demand. The promiscuous charity is immense. This, it has been demonstrated, is only a bounty on pauperism and dishonesty. Accordingly, the more judicious have adopted the rule of giving no assistance, in any case, until they have previously ascertained the actual condition of the applicant. Of course, his place of abode is inquired for. But in most cases it happens that his habitation is not to be found.

To meet the present condition of the poor a large expedient has been devised. You doubtless observed, in Mr. Barnard's First Report of his ministry at large in Boston, an allusion to the Society for Promoting Education and Industry among the Poorer Classes of this city. This society originated, I believe, with a Mr. Curtis, a goldsmith. Its object is to raise the moral character of the poor, to find employment for the idle, and to be the channel through which all charities are dispensed. In theory nothing can be more wise, liberal, and generous. The outlines of the plan are these: — First, there is the society at large; then, an auxiliary association in each ward of the city. Each of these sub-societies appoints from its members a number of visitors, larger or smaller according to the wants of the ward. Every ward is divided into districts, and each district has as many visitors as its extent and condition may require. In some districts, of course, there are no poor. It is the duty of each visitor to give to the paupers within his limits such instruction and assistance as comport with the design of the institution. It would seem, at first sight, that on such a plan everything might be accomplished, especially as regards the prevention of promiscuous almsgiving, and the lending encouragement in many ways to those whose situation might preclude their obtaining employment. Yet it is thought by some that the society will

accomplish little or nothing. The office of a visitor of the poor, it is said, is one which demands great and peculiar exertions. Nothing can be accomplished without constant labour. There is demanded, also, a very considerable knowledge of human nature, great tact, and an intimate acquaintance with the condition of the poor. It is urged, that many, perhaps the most, of those members of the society who are its visitors, being men actively engaged in business, are not able to afford the time and labour necessary to this great work; and that on account of their habits of thought and life, they must be, to a very considerable degree, deficient in the necessary knowledge and skill. This can be obtained, even by a man of the requisite talents, only after much experience. A visitor of the poor should be trained to his work. He should be, in every respect, a practical philanthropist. His office should be regarded as a profession, as much as any other. For these reasons, it is thought that the society, although erected on such a liberal and generous foundation, must be inefficient. One thing is wanting, it is believed, to enable it to do all that such institutions can reasonably be expected to accomplish, — which is, that the society should incorporate with its own plan that of Dr. Tuckerman. It is urged, that each ward, instead of appointing its own members to visit the poor, should support one or more individuals, as may be required, as their representatives, who, with the requisite qualifications, should devote their whole time to the work. This would make the institution complete, and then, probably, it would regenerate the city. — But trouble is looked for from another quarter, and how much it may affect the influence of the society it is impossible to tell. There are some among the more bigoted ultra-Orthodox of the community who look upon it with suspicion or hostility, as a sort of monster, of which it were wise to beware. They say that it originated with and is supported by infidels and (if one may be allowed to make the distinction) by Unitarians, — some of whom, by the way, are among its most efficient friends. And although it numbers among its members many who are sound in creed, yet what good, it is asked, can come of thus unequally yoking the faithful to unbelievers? What can be expected of an institution which employs so many unholy hands in its councils and labours? The reason of all this outcry is, that the society has seen fit to insert an article in its constitution by which it is prohibited from printing and circulating any sectarian publications. Still, it does not exclude the communica-

tion of as much practical instruction as the visitor may see fit to give. If such bigotry did not receive our profound pity, it would be beneath our contempt. Such an institution, however, is loudly demanded here, and if it is built on a safe foundation, it will hardly be shaken by the envy of fanaticism.

After service to-day, I spent two pleasant hours with Mr. Arnold, who, you know, is a minister at large in this city. Perhaps some of your readers may not be aware that this gentleman is supported in his office by subscribers to the object in Mr. Ware's and the Second Church — both Unitarian. He is principally confined to the eighth ward, although he sometimes extends his walks into the ninth. He has lately opened a hall in Prince street, where he has a morning and evening service on the Sabbath, and attends a Sunday-school from one to three in the afternoon. The number of his hearers is about forty, on the average. Among them are some few Unitarians, who, on account of their local situation or pecuniary circumstances, have connected themselves with him permanently. There are usually from thirty to forty children in the school. He told me that his success, although he came to this city an entire stranger, had been thus far nearly equal to his expectations, which were not low. He thinks that, in a good degree, he has won the confidence of most of those whom he visits. Connected with his mission is an association of ladies, belonging to the two societies which I have just mentioned, whose object is to furnish clothing &c. to those whom the minister at large may think proper objects of such charity. They have been his very interested and efficient supporters.

The prospects of the spread of Unitarianism in this city are not great. The spirit of inquiry has never been awakened here. I judge there are not a few infidels to be found in respectable classes of society, who have gradually slid by easy transitions into unbelief, without the aid of any serious investigation. Indeed, in such a city as this, where error and fanaticism and violent dogmatism have been continually breasting the barrier which an age somewhat enlightened has set up against them, it were sufficiently wonderful if there were not many of this class. In a city where Calvinism has been so long exhibited in its most revolting forms, where fanaticism has been so rife, where the dogmatism of the clergy is so great, and the power of denunciation so often tried, it cannot

be strange that many should be driven into hostility to the claims of religion, and more into indifference. Yet there is no spirit of inquiry. Some violent commotion is needed, it may be, to disturb the waters — the heavy tranquillity of unbelief, the unconscious submissiveness to the voice of authority, and the timid reverence for old forms. — The two Unitarian congregations are composed almost entirely of New-Englanders. Few or no converts have been made. Perhaps one reason is, that the more northern style of preaching is not efficient for the south; something more impassioned, something which will *take* more immediately, is needed. A very intelligent gentleman from Washington said to me, "The more cool and sustained style and manner of preaching, which is persuasive at the north, will not suit us. We want something more vehement and forceful. Without it our people will not put themselves in the way of hearing Unitarianism." But the great reason is to be found in the apathy of the public mind to all religious investigations, united with the violent prejudice, in particular, which there is against our faith. What can you expect where so many firmly believe, what they have been told by their religious teachers, that it is no less than spiritual death to hear our "infidel" expositions of the Bible, which are the more subtle and destructive because the ingenuity of man is aided by the wiles of the Devil? However, a time must come. Yet we are not altogether without encouragement. Mr. —— said, "It is my firm conviction that a man of the requisite talents and devotedness, who should come to this city and be willing to 'cast his bread on the waters,' — let him preach in a hall at first, — would gather around him a respectable Unitarian congregation. With the right manner, he would make some converts, and would be joined by those whose local situation might render it inconvenient for them to attend the other Unitarian churches in the city." He instanced some large societies which have grown up in this way. He told me, that, the day before, a gentleman had come to him from the east part of the city, requesting his assistance in building up a Unitarian society in that section. The gentleman told him that there were a dozen or more Unitarians in the immediate circle of his acquaintance, and that he could not doubt there were many beyond it. This indicates that much may yet be done to diffuse the influence of pure Christianity in this great city.

A few evenings since, I stepped into Dr. ——'s vestry,

and found there a large congregation. Dr. —— is more known, I believe, than any other Presbyterian clergyman of this city. I went with the expectation of being edified if he had a practical subject, but was disappointed. The devotional exercises were cold, and I thought not sufficiently reverent; certainly, they were not impressive. In the manner of the lecture, which was extemporary, there was a good deal of trick. The comparatively unimportant introduction and passages which required no particular emphasis, as well as those parts which should have been more impressive, were characterized by the same management, the same monotonous modulation of the voice — now loud and hard, and anon sinking away into an inaudible whisper — now declamatory, and now familiar. I can imagine, however, that such a manner might have affected many of his hearers, had there been a current of feeling in it. But there was not. To my "Unitarian coldness," the light, irreverent, and, as I thought, somewhat flippant manner of his closing exhortation, was anything but pleasing. I thought that among the causes which make men trample religion under their feet as the dust of the earth, such a manner might not be inoperative. Calvinism is essentially cold and hard. However, there is this to be said, that with men who are so continually obliged to traverse the same round of unvaried exhortations, almost from hour to hour, such services must necessarily be little more than a form, which the exhausted intellectual and moral powers are incapable of filling with life. Perhaps I am wrong in sending you this critique on a familar lecture; indeed, I should not have said so much, were the manner to which I have alluded peculiar to Dr. ——; but you, as well as I, have observed that it belongs to a certain class of preachers.

But I have filled out my sheet. You may hear from me again soon.

Yours, very sincerely,

J. Q. Day.

The Son of Man.

WHOEVER has read with attention the books of the New Testament, must have observed how frequently our Saviour calls himself the Son of Man. This seems to be his favourite appellation, the title by which he chose to designate his office and destination. It is a name given him by no other but himself. Among the many instances in which it occurs in the gospel history, there is only one in which it is not used by Jesus, and he seldom uses any other. This fact seems to authorize the supposition that the title in question is more truly indicative than any other of the Saviour's character and commission; and if this be the case, it is the duty of every Christian inquirer to ascertain its true meaning and import. Let us, then, see what is meant by the title, Son of Man, and in what sense it is applicable to the Messiah.

According to a well-known idiom of the eastern languages, which was closely followed by the writers of the New Testament, the word which signifies *son* has also many other significations. It is used to denote various relations besides the filial relation, and, among others, the relation of office and of destination. Thus "the children of the bride-chamber" are those who have offices to perform at the marriage-ceremony; the "sons of the kingdom" are those for whom the kingdom was designed; and so Jesus may be called the Son of Man, inasmuch as he was destined to become the teacher of men. Again, this word is used in connexion with any particular quality, being, or thing, to denote a person distinguished for that quality, or possessing the attributes of that being or thing. Thus the wicked are called "sons of wickedness;" the afflicted, "sons of affliction;" St. Paul says, "All who are led by the spirit of God are the sons of God;" and in this sense Jesus is called the Son of Man, because he possessed, while on earth, the attributes of humanity. It was, probably, in this sense that our Saviour assumed the title. He used it to indicate his human nature, and the peculiar relation in which he stood to men as their saviour and guide; just as he used the term, Son of God, to denote the very different relation which he sustained to the divine Being. We are to understand, then, by the term, Son of Man, nothing more than, simply, *man;* we are to understand by it that Jesus was the representative of human nature, such as it will

be when completely redeemed, enlightened, and sanctified. He was a living example of humanity carried to perfection. And this, perhaps, is the most profitable way of considering Jesus's life and commission.

I do not intend to use this interpretation of a scriptural phrase as an argument for any one of the conflicting theories respecting our Saviour's nature and origin; on this subject I profess not to have formed, nor to be able to form, a decisive opinion. I understand not the mystery of the Word, and am persuaded that no one can know who the Son is but the Father, and he to whom the Father will reveal him. We read of an in-dwelling, in-forming power, coëval and coördinate with God, manifested first in the creation of the world, and then in the revelation of divine truth; but whatever may have been the nature of this power, it is certain that the instrument with which it wrought for us in the revelation of the Christian religion was an instrument of flesh and blood; it came to us in a human form, it spoke to us with a human voice, and enlightened us by a human example. Whatever Jesus was in the sight of God who sent him, to us he exhibited himself as a man; his appearance was strictly human; he was born, grew from childhood to maturity, lived and died on earth, as a man; widely distinguished, it is true, in power, virtue, and holiness, from all others who have ever before or since borne that name, but still resembling them in all the visible features of his being here. We are to consider him, therefore, as the intended pattern of what human nature would be, if fully unfolded and redeemed. He was perfect, but his perfection was the perfection of humanity; and we are justified in the conclusion, that whatever he showed himself to be, it is in the power of man to become; whatever we admire in his character and conduct is but a representation of the virtues and perfections, the power, intelligence, and love, which man may attain to, and which shall yet be made manifested in the sons of God. Whatever human nature has of capacities yet undeveloped, whatever attainments in knowledge and strength lie within the reach of humanity, are more or less clearly unfolded in the life of Jesus; and this, I repeat it, is the most instructive and encouraging view we can take of his life. As the Son of God, he demands our reverence; as the Herald of a divine law, as the Teacher of precious truths, he claims our attention; but as the Son of Man, he moves our hearts, and awakens our deepest love. No other name which the Saviour bore places the object of his ministry

in such a pleasing and affecting light, brings him so near to our wants and affections, or connects him so closely with human interests and human hopes. We had need of such a redeemer. How could our erring race have been reclaimed and our fallen nature regenerated, but by the labours and the example of one who took upon himself our infirmities, struggled with our temptations, wept at our griefs, and overcame the world with our weapons? I can conceive that God should have revealed himself in a different way; I can conceive of other and more striking methods which he might have chosen to declare his will, and make known those truths through the belief of which cometh salvation; but I can conceive of none that would have been so effectual in the redemption of man. He might have written his command, with its threats and promises, in the heavens, so distinctly that everyone might read and understand; or he might have commissioned a seraph to traverse the earth from north to south, calling upon men everywhere to repent; and men would have read the command and heard the call with an anxious desire to obey and be saved; but *the way* and *the light* which we have by the Son of Man would have been wanting, an example of *human perfection* would have been wanting, an instance of righteousness complete in every point and fitted to the circumstances and conditions of the world in which we live would have been wanting, an instance of virtue victorious in every possible trial and triumphing over suffering and death would have been wanting, and with our present constitution these wants would have been fatal. Whoever understands the necessities of human nature, must see the necessity of a human ministry in reconciling man to God.

It is not necessary to enumerate all the advantages that flow from a human ministry, but a few of them deserve our notice. There is one which will readily suggest itself to every mind; I mean the benefit we derive from a human example. None but the example of a man can fully answer the purposes of an example unto men. We may form an image of divine perfection and make it our model; but what mortal can hope to be like God, whose ways are as far above our ways as the heaven is above the earth? What he is and does by the law of his being, we must do, if we do it at all, I had almost said against the laws of our nature, I mean with infinite toil and difficulty. Neither could the example of an angel, supposing an angel to have wrought for us and among us, be sufficient to the end proposed in the ministry of Christ; for

angels know not our trials, they have never drunk of our cup, nor been baptized with our baptism. But in Jesus we have a son of man perfect in holiness, a human example of that which is required of human nature, a living proof that man may become what man is commanded to be. Such an example begets a blessed trust in human nature; it is a commentary on the divine law, full of instruction, encouragement, and consolation; it shows that the way of duty is never impracticable, nor the crown of righteousness unattainable; it breathes a joyful confidence into the feeblest Christian who sincerely follows after righteousness, and causes him to pant more earnestly for the kingdom of God.

Again, we shall perceive the necessity of a human ministry, if we consider the manner in which God has chosen to conduct the affairs of the moral world. It is his way to act upon the soul, not suddenly, but gradually; he affects the generations of men, not by abrupt and insulated acts, but by a series of influences. He carries his purposes by the continuous operation of secondary causes; and employs the combined agency of institutions, each one of which would alone be inadequate to the end proposed. Accordingly, the end proposed in the Christian dispensation, that is, the salvation of man, must either be inconsistent with all the known operations of God's moral goverment, or it must be accomplished, not by a single word from heaven, but by the gradual operation of such institutions as we now have. But to establish such institutions and to give them that sanction necessary to secure their perpetuity, there must needs be a Christian sect, which should be able to trace its history with certainty to the precise period when a divine communication was made. In order to this, it was necessary that, in the beginning of the Christian era, an association should be formed like that of the twelve apostles, who by their labours might disseminate far and wide the doctrines they had received from their common Master, establish the institutions which he had appointed, and thus lay the foundations of a perpetual church and an everlasting kingdom. Now how could such an association have been formed without a son of man for their head, without a human leader, a being who though far above them was yet like them, one of their own kind, a being of whom they might learn as of a teacher from heaven, and yet in whose steps they could follow, as in the steps of a fellow-man, with a reasonable hope of emulating his example? Such an one was Jesus Christ, the messenger of God and the teacher of

men. Coming with authority from heaven, and yet living and dying on earth as a man, he was the being to reconcile man to God, and to establish a kingdom of divine origin and power, yet having its foundation in the eternal principles of human nature, and bearing a beautiful analogy to the whole plan of Providence as displayed in the natural and moral world.

Furthermore, let us remember the influence of the love which we feel for Christ considered as a fellow-being who laboured, suffered, and died in our behalf. I believe that with the true Christian this love is the strongest motive to Christian excellence. It was the sentiment which acted most powerfully on the early disciples, which nerved and manned them for the dangers of their ministry, sustained them in all its fearful trials, gave them that spirit of enterprise which led to such unwearied exertions, and enabled them to meet death firmly and even cheerfully in defence of the cause they had espoused. Nor did this sentiment perish with them; in all ages and stages of the church there have been many, who, from a love of Christ, have imbibed the spirit of Christ, and have been led by a veneration of his character to the imitation of his example. Now if instead of a being clothed in a human form, possessing human attributes, and tempted in all points as we are, God had sent us an angel from heaven, having no similitude to man nor anything in common with him, we should regard such a messenger with reverence and, it may be, with love, but not with that fervent gratitude which the Christian feels towards his Master; for our gratitude to any finite benefactor must needs be proportioned to the toil which we suppose him to have spent and the sacrifices we suppose him to have made in our behalf; and we cannot suppose that the work which was so difficult and painful to a human nature would be equally so to an angelic nature. We are bound to Jesus by a sympathy which never could exist between us and a superior order of beings. It is impossible to contemplate the scene which passed in the garden of Gethsemane on the night preceding the crucifixion, and to reflect that the being who stands foremost in that scene suffered the same pangs which any one of us would suffer in view of an ignominious and painful death, without experiencing an emotion of gratitude, pure as our love of God, and warm as our love for the children of this earth, such an emotion as only the Son of Man can excite.

In addition to these considerations let me mention one

more, namely, the encouragement and confidence which the ministry of Jesus gives to our noblest exertions and our dearest hopes; to our noblest exertions, because it shows, as I have observed, that the righteousness which is required of us has been attained on earth; to our dearest hopes, because in the history of Jesus we learn that these hopes have already been realized by one who inhabited a mortal tenement, because in the resurrection of the Son of Man we have an earnest and a pledge of our own immortality.

Such are some of the benefits of a human ministry. It is well for us that we have this ministry. It was well that the Word became flesh, that the Son of God was also the Son of Man. Are we beset on all sides by temptations? we can look to one who was "tempted in all points as we are, and yet without sin." Hath it pleased God to visit us with afflictions? the gospel points us to the thorn-crowned Jesus, and says, "Behold the Man!" however great the trials you are called to bear, he hath borne greater; however great the task you are called to perform, he hath done more. I am convinced that, for practical purposes, the views which have been offered cannot be urged too strongly; we cannot dwell too much on those points in which our Saviour's condition resembled our own. We should remember that like us he was exposed to temptation; he might have abused his miraculous powers in the pursuit of unworthy objects, he might have made them subservient to the gratification of his earthly appetites, he might have astonished the multitude with stupendous prodigies, he might have raised himself to the summit of temporal power and made the kingdoms of the earth his own; but he did not for a moment think of attempting any of these things; he sought only to do the will of his Father, and there was no guile found in him. He resembled us in those feelings and emotions proper to man. Remember how he wept at the grave of Lazarus, and how he mourned at the thought of Jerusalem's downfall! The sight of little children drew from him expressions of the tenderest regard. We see him moved with compassion by human wretchedness, and warmed with just indignation when he purified the temple, and rebuked the hard-hearted Pharisee. He resembled us, further, in his dependence upon God, and on all occasions he manifested a deep sense of that dependence. He often communed in secret with the Father who sent him, looked to heaven for support, and sought the aid

of the Almighty in prayer. "Of myself," he says, "I can do nothing;" "I am come in my Father's name;" "As the Father hath taught me I speak these things." When overcome with anguish at the thought of his approaching trial, he fortifies his soul by submission to his Father's will; and the last words which he uttered, while expiring on the cross, were, "Father, into thy hands, I commend my spirit."

But there is one point, it will be said, in which Jesus was widely distinguished from us; and that is, in the possession of miraculous powers. In this respect he was indeed widely distinguished from us, and seems like a being of a different order; but when we reflect on the nature of a miracle,—when we consider the promise which our Saviour gave his disciples, that if they had faith they should be able to do what he did and should find nothing impossible,—when we remember that God did also work miracles by the prophets who preceded Jesus, and by the disciples who came after him,—the distinction between him and us, even in this respect, will be found to be a distinction of office rather than of nature.

God forbid that these remarks should lessen, in any degree, our reverence for the great Author of our religion! they are designed to increase that reverence and to make it more effectual. The views which have been offered are not mere speculations, they have their practical importance. By considering Jesus as the representative of man such as he is designed and destined to be, as the personification of all that is good and holy in us, we give to his life a new meaning and importance. The Saviour's history has never yet received the attention which it deserves, considered as a part, and a very important part, of the divine revelation. Christians of all ages and climes have searched the Scriptures rather for speculative than for practical truths. Every word of Jesus and his apostles, which was supposed to bear in any way on the points at issue between contending parties, has been brought into notice, criticized, explained, strained to a wider or a narrower interpretation, as it suited the views of this sect or that sect; but while the doctrines or supposed doctrines of our religion have been made the subject of endless controversy, the gospel history, with its deep meaning and its rich funds of practical wisdom, has passed unnoticed, like a common tale. Let not such neglect be laid to our charge, but let us bestow on the works which Jesus wrought the same study and attention which we give to his doctrines. The Saviour's life is as important a subject of investigation to his

followers as his teachings; and it may even be more safely relied on as a source of religious truth, inasmuch as actions are less likely to be misrepresented than words. Let us, then, seek instruction from the Saviour's actions. Let us contemplate him, not only as he is exhibited to us in those great and momentous points where he seems to us like a being from above, and shines as with a light from heaven — in the wilderness of temptation, on the mount of transfiguration, and in the place of Calvary, — but let us follow him through the whole of his recorded life, from Bethlehem to Jerusalem, from his baptism to his grave. Let us watch him in the most trifling passages of his ministry, at the marriage-feast, at the table of sinners and publicans, and on the waters of Gennesareth. Let us learn of him as he is exhibited to us in public and in private, in the temple and in the family circle, by the sea-side and by the grave-side, in the presence of joy and of pain, in the presence of man and of God. Let no act that is recorded of him pass unnoticed, but be treasured up as a lesson of deep wisdom. Let us learn to consider every fragment of his life as having a double value, an historical and an emblematic importance, as a memorial of what our greatest benefactor was and did, and as a presage of what we may be and do. Let us learn to regard his history, not as the history of an individual only, but as the history of man; of man, not as he now is, or has been, but as he may be, and, we trust, will be, "when the Son of Man shall come in his glory."

F. H. Hedge.

Letters to Unbelievers.

No. I.

NATURE AND CAUSES OF INFIDELITY.

Fellow Citizens,

You seem to practise no special concealment of your opinions respecting religion. You openly reject Christianity, and many of you boldly attack the foundations of natural theology. Your leaders are constantly inviting controversy, and attributing the silence of believers to cowardice. I have determined to accept their challenge. I am ready to give

the subject of infidelity a thorough discussion. I trust I shall not disgrace my profession by the exhibition of an unchristian spirit. I have no personal or party purposes to serve. I am truly desirous of doing good to you as a body, and also of benefiting mankind. The public must be the jury, and by their decision we must abide. My first object will be to expose the unreasonableness of your cause. In this introductory communication, I shall confine my remarks to the nature, causes, occasions, and existing state of infidelity.

I. *Nature of Belief and Unbelief.*

1. Who is the believer? Who is the Christian? Who is the disciple of Christ? Our divine Master can answer these questions most satisfactorily. "Jesus, therefore, said to those Jews who believed on him, 'If ye adhere to my doctrine, ye are truly my disciples.'" According to this declaration, all who receive Jesus as their religious Teacher and believe in the doctrines he taught, may be called believers, Christians, disciples. This definition will include all who conscientiously consider themselves the sincere followers of the inspired Teacher; for it leaves every individual to decide for himself as to what particulars are embraced in the Christian doctrine as laid down in its records, as also which of the many branches of evidence for Christianity is most conclusive. Some think that they discover in the teachings of Christ many doctrines, others fewer. No mortal, however, has a right to determine whether his fellow-men believe too much or too little. There is, also, among those who claim the Christian name almost every variety of character. But no human tribunal has ever been authorized to declare the degree of holiness essential to present discipleship or future salvation. I would, therefore, concede the Christian name to all who profess it; leaving it to conscience and the Searcher of hearts to determine whether and how far they are justly entitled to it. — *John* viii. 31.

2. Who, then, is the unbeliever? Who is the infidel? Who is the anti-christian? These questions must be answered in accordance with my former conclusion. I must, therefore, declare that all who reject Jesus as their religious Teacher and disbelieve his doctrine, are unbelievers, infidels, anti-christians. A person may receive all the doctrines of natural religion, may believe in the immortality of the soul and in a future retribution, may be a worshipper of God, may even acknowledge the excellence of the Christian morality, may

revere the character of Jesus as the purest and most exalted which has ever been presented for the imitation of man, — still, this alone by no means entitles him to the name of Christian; he may make no pretensions to the name; he may be nothing more than a mere deist. In a word, while I dare not deny the Christian name to any who may claim it, I must regard as unbelievers all who professedly disown Christ as their religious Teacher and reject his doctrines. I consider the definitions now given sufficiently explicit and accurate for all the purposes of the present discussion. For I leave each of you to determine for yourself, whether you reject Christ and Christianity, and whether you will be called an infidel or a Christian.

II. *Grounds of Belief in Christianity.*

Christianity is embraced on several different grounds, which I will now consider. Some believe on the evidence derived from prophecy, miracles, history, the effects of the gospel. They have given the various branches of the argument a candid examination. They have carefully weighed the objections which have been urged from the first ages to the present period. They have arisen from their thorough investigation, firm believers in the divine origin of the Christian religion. Among this number are included many of almost every denomination. This is, however, peculiarly the case with men of liberal education. Look into our community, and you find our distinguished statesmen, lawyers, physicians, professors, and scholars, included in this description. In this section of our country you can scarcely find an exception to this statement.

2. Some believe on the evidence derived from the Scriptures themselves. They have searched the records of revelation with patience and prayer. They have often perused the artless and unstudied narratives of the evangelists. They have noticed the change which took place in the opinions and conduct of the apostles, on the resurrection of their Master. They have deeply studied his history, his works, his words, his character. They feel perfectly satisfied that no unlettered fishermen, that no men of learning, could have described such a person as Jesus, unless he really existed, discoursed, conducted, as they have represented. They are firmly convinced, from his life and death, his doctrines, precepts, and prophecies, that he was no impostor and no en-

thusiast. They discover a truth, a beauty, a sublimity in his religion, which elevates it above any earthly origin. And although they may be at a loss how to refute all the cavils of unbelievers, they have come to the deliberate conclusion that Christianity is the truth of God.

3. Some believe on the evidence of their own consciousness and observation. They have formed Christian characters. They have learned to love and worship their heavenly Father. They have imitated, in some humble degree, the example of their chosen Master. They have endeavoured to live soberly, righteously, godlily. They know, from their own experience, that their obedience of the gospel requisitions produces pure and unalloyed happiness. They also know that their deficiencies and failings give them more or less misery. They know that the great truths of revelation are perfectly adapted to the essential wants of their nature. They know that its consolations and hopes are admirably calculated to keep them from iniquity, to stimulate them to the acquisition of the highest degree of mental and moral excellence, to support them under their trials and perplexities, and to comfort them under the severest afflictions. They know that the religion of Christ is able to sustain the soul in the hour of death; for they have seen their friends leave the world in joy and triumph. And although they are ignorant on many subjects, although they may not answer all the objections you bring against their views, yet they are thoroughly convinced of the truth of Christianity from the testimony of their own consciousness and observation; and you can no more shake their faith by your reasonings than you can remove mountains by means of them.

4. Some believe on the testimony of competent and unprejudiced judges. All have not the leisure and information necessary for a thorough investigation of the Christian evidences, or for a perfect understanding of all parts of the sacred Scriptures. All have not formed Christian characters. Yet there are many, who are not included in either of the other classes, who must not be considered unbelievers. They rest satisfied, in this instance, as in a thousand others, with the assurance of those who have fairly and candidly examined the whole subject. Let me illustrate this assertion by an example. Some men of learning have studied the science of astronomy. They assure you that the earth revolves on its axis once in twenty-four hours, and moves round the sun once a year. You believe these and similar facts, al-

though contradicted by your senses, on the word of these learned men. Now the same individuals have also investigated the science of religion. They express their firm belief in the existence of God and the truth of Christianity. Have they any stronger motive to deceive in the latter case than in the former? Are they not as well qualified to decide according to the evidence presented, in the one instance as in the other? If you rely on their testimony in relation to the facts of astronomy, where is the consistency of rejecting their testimony in relation to Christianity? There is none. Many, however, do act consistently, and believe the gospel on the word of competent and impartial witnesses.

Such are the grounds on which Christianity is believed. All these, however, may not be known to everyone. Sometimes an individual is influenced by the first three; sometimes, by the last three; sometimes, only by the third and fourth; according to his education and habits of thought. Even those who rely simply on the testimony of others may feel as much confidence in the truth of the gospel as they do in a thousand other facts about which they entertain no doubts. Every believer, however, should examine both the external and the internal evidence for himself; and especially should he form a Christian character. Then his faith would rest on a rock.

III. *Causes of Unbelief.*

There are several causes of infidelity, which I will now illustrate. Ignorance of the evidences of Christianity is the principal. Although the evidences for the truth of natural theology and for the divine origin of the gospel are abundant, conclusive, and intelligible, yet the great majority of Christian parents have strangely neglected to teach any portion of them to their children. Although, in this section of our country, ample means are provided for the education of all classes, yet this most important branch of instruction has seldom been introduced into our schools and academies. Although we have had an active and conscientious clergy, in whom the people have confided, yet they rarely instructed their hearers in this most essential subject. Hence, the great mass of our inhabitants have arrived at years of maturity without any satisfactory knowledge of the grounds on which the whole fabric of our religion securely rests; consequently, some of the number become an easy prey to the sophistical arts of the unbeliever.

2. Ignorance of the Scriptures is the second cause of unbelief. Although we have had them in our houses and perused them in our families, although we have heard them read in our schools and churches, although we have been familiar with the sound of their phraseology from infancy, although we profess to make them the only standard of our religious faith and practice, yet it is a most lamentable fact that multitudes have arrived at maturity without any correct understanding of their contents. Various causes have contributed to this result; their being written in languages now dead; their constant allusion to manners, customs, and events, with which we are unacquainted; the incorrectness of our translation; its divisions into chapters and verses without any regard to the sense; the common practice of reading them as a task in childhood; these and other cirstances have greatly conspired to render them obscure, uninteresting, and uninstructive. Hence, those who have obtained but a slight and superficial acquaintance with their truths are not able to discern their beauty, harmony, sublimity, which have satisfied thousands of their divine origin; consequently, some are easily led astray to infidelity.

3. The want of a Christian character is the third cause of unbelief. Some parents suppose that their children come into being totally depraved, and that they can do nothiug but sin until converted by the special influences of the holy spirit. They have, therefore, neglected to cultivate, in their tender years, in a proper manner and to a proper degree, the peculiar graces of the gospel. Others, who believe that their offspring are born unpolluted, have not adopted the necessary measures for preserving their purity and innocence, and for bringing them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Others, again, who are truly pious, have not felt qualified to impart religious instruction to their rising families, or to train them to the duties of holiness. And there are a still larger number, who make no profession of religion, and who are not so inconsistent as to attempt to instruct others in that which they do not themselves possess. In our schools very little attention has been given to the Christian education of the pupils. The clergy, in too many instances, have rested satisfied if the lambs of their flocks recited the Assembly's Catechism. The consequence of all this past neglect is, that multitudes have arrived at years of maturity without that love to God and Christ and man, which peculiarly constitute the Christian character. They are, therefore, destitute of that

experimental evidence of the truth of the gospel which may well defy the assaults of infidelity.

4. Want of consistency in receiving human testimony is the last cause of unbelief. This assertion may be illustrated by an example. Suppose you were divided into two parties on some law question. You ask all the judges in the commonwealth to meet and hear the cause. You lay before them all the evidence on both sides. After a thorough investigation they give a unanimous opinion. They declare that the case admits of no doubt; and that any jury on earth, who should be governed by the common principles of evidence, must return a certain verdict. Would either party carry the question into court? No. Why not? Because you have obtained the candid opinion of a large number of legal gentlemen, who could have no motive to deceive you. Very well. These same individuals have examined the evidence for natural and revealed religion. They have given the opposers of the truth a fair and patient hearing. They assure you that Christianity is true; and that any jury on earth, infidel or Christian, must give a verdict in its favour, if governed in their decision by the common principles of evidence. This is the well known fact in relation to all our judges. Now why do you not abide by their unanimous decision, in the latter case as well as in the former? Are they any more liable to be deceived, or have they any stronger motive to deceive others, in the last instance than in the first? No. Here, then, is a glaring inconsistency in the conduct of many who have looked only at one side of the question in relation to Christianity.

Such are the causes of infidelity. More or less of the number exist in the minds and hearts of unbelievers. Sometimes all are combined in the case of one individual, and sometimes only a part. But to find a person who has thoroughly examined both sides of the evidence for natural and revealed religion, who has a correct understanding of the meaning of the Scriptures, who is possessed of a Christian character, who acts consistently in relation to human testimony, and who yet is an unbelever, is an utter impossibility.

IV. *Occasions of Infidelity.*

There are several occasions of unbelief, which I will briefly mention. Unreasonable claims for the Bible have occasioned some to reject all revelation. They have heard Christian preachers affirm that all parts of the Hebrew and

Christian Scriptures were given by special divine inspiration, that every word is inspired, and that no errors are to be found in either the Old or the New Testament. They have opened the sacred records, and discovered some sentiments which could not have emanated from our heavenly Father, and some mistakes and discrepancies which could not have been dictated by the infinite Jehovah. Instead of giving up the indefensible theory of verbal and plenary inspiration, as thousands of believers have done, they have very unreasonably discarded the whole volume, without any proper examination, and taken sides with the infidel.

2. Irrational, absurd, and inhuman doctrines have occasioned some to renounce all religion. They have heard opinions advanced for Christian truth, which contradicted the clearest dictates of reason and experience, which outraged the best feelings of the human heart, and which could not be reconciled with the paternal character of God. Instead of discarding these as the corruptions of Christianity, like thousands of our best Christians, they have very unwisely rejected the blessed gospel itself, without any satisfactory investigation of its pages, and united with the anti-christian.

3. The fanatical extravagancies of Christians have occasioned some to reject Christianity. They have witnessed the disgraceful scenes sometimes exhibited in a modern revival. They have heard the heated rhapsodies, the unscriptural denunciations, and the unreasonable requisitions of some of the leaders — their artful contrivances, their disingenuous management, and their shameful practices. They have become thoroughly disgusted with the want of common sense, candour, honesty, and charity, often manifested on such occasions. Instead of denouncing these as the delusions of misguided zealots, like thousands of every denomination, they have very hastily condemned religion itself, and given their influence to the cause of infidelity.

4. Deception in religious experience has occasioned some to renounce Christianity. They have passed through a revival. They have been overwhelmed with anxiety and sorrow. They have been excited with song and triumph. They have related most satisfactory accounts of their conversion. They supposed the work of reformation was accomplished. They expected to find the performance of every Christian duty easy and delightful. But after a short interval, their unnatural elevation has departed. The same [illegible] the same habits, which they

possessed before their supposed regeneration, remain and are active. They find that they have been deceived. Instead, therefore, of correcting their previous notions by more just views of the nature of religion, like thousands of Christians, they have very strangely denounced all religion as a delusion, without knowing anything of its real character, and taken up arms with the enemies of revelation.

5. The unchristian temper and conduct of misguided believers have occasioned some to condemn Christianity. They have known individuals of their acquaintance who were made worse by a supposed conversion, — who became less kind, affectionate, and amiable, — manifested much self-righteousness, spiritual pride, and uncharitableness, — became exclusive, bigoted, and gloomy, — neglected many of the important duties of life, and frowned on its innocent amusements. Others, who have made great professions, have been guilty of various crimes, such as dishonesty, unkindness, licentiousness. These unchristian dispositions and actions of self-deceived and imperfect believers have influenced the opinions of some who were lookers-on respecting religion itself. Instead of condemning what is expressly forbidden by the Saviour himself, like thousands of his worthy disciples, they have very inconsistently rejected an essential good on account of its occasional abuses; and aimed a death-blow at that religion which is their best friend.

6. The disputes of Christians have occasioned some to oppose revelation. There exists a difference of opinion among believers on many important topics of religion. Each individual feels confident that his views are both true and valuable. Hence, various books are published on the points in dispute. Some individuals, who have little or no interest in such discussions, consider all such writings as weak or injurious. They do not examine them sufficiently to understand the argument on either side. They are careful to notice all manifestations of an improper spirit, and all offensive and severe personalities. They conclude that all this trifling is designed to keep the people in a quarrel, and to secure money for the authors. Instead, therefore, of regarding religious controversy as necessary, and all unchristian remarks as blamable, like thousands of every denomination, they have very unjustly turned against all revealed truth, and joined hands with its violent opposers.

7. Erroneous instruction in childhood has occasioned some to renounce Christianity. They were early taught catechisms

and human formularies. They were induced to believe that certain opinions were essential to the gospel. In after years they have not been able to find any scriptural foundation for many doctrines which they had considered most precious. They have experienced a most heart-sickening disappointment. They have been almost ready to accuse their teachers of wilful deception. Instead of rejecting these human additions and errors, like thousands who have found themselves in a similar predicament, they have neglected further investigation into the meaning of the Scriptures, and most unreasonably united with anti-christians.

8. Modern Universalism has occasioned some to renounce the gospel. They adopted irrational principles of interpretation. This became necessary in order to exclude the doctrine of future retribution from the Scriptures. These principles destroyed all evidence of a future existence. They acted in consistency with their modes of sophistical reasoning. They rejected all revelation. This is the testimony of some who were once active members of that denomination, but who are now among the leaders of the infidel party. Had they adopted correct principles of interpretation, admitted the doctrine of a righteous retribution in the future state, and cultivated piety in their own hearts, as some of the number have done, they would at this very time belong to the company of consistent believers.

9. Personal depravity has occasioned some to deny the truth of all religion. Either they were avaricious, and endeavoured to destroy Christianity because its institutions required some pecuniary aid for their maintainance; or they have been actuated by a love of singularity, a pride of opinion, a consummate vanity, or an inveterate prejudice. Either they were unprincipled, and wished for a license to indulge their vicious propensities; or they were abandoned, and endeavoured to make themselves believe what they hoped might prove true. From all these classes the ranks of unbelievers have been greatly increased.

10. The exertions of infidels themselves have occasioned many to join in opposing the Christian religion. These individuals have exhibited a zeal worthy of a better cause. They have published papers, pamphlets, books, in no small quantities; and they have spread them through the community with great industry. They have urged them upon the attention of the young, the credulous, the uneducated, the unguarded, the unprincipled. They have talked long and

plausibly with those over whom they could exert an influence, and represented their own happiness as completed by the renunciation of the Bible. They have lectured in the city and in the country; and what with sophistical reasonings and bold assertions and sneering ridicule, they have made many proselytes to their cold and heartless system of belief.

All these, I call *occasions* of infidelity, and not *causes;* for if the individuals who have taken sides with the unbeliever had been well instructed in the gospel and its evidences, if they had possessed a Christian character, and acted with consistency in relation to human testimony, they could not have been driven from a belief in Christianity by the errors, or follies, or vices, of its misguided friends. They would have done, as thousands and tens of thousands of the most worthy men in the world have done, — rejected every thing irrational, unscriptural, and immoral, and still held fast to the eternal and unchangeable truths of Jehovah.

V. *Infidelity in this Country.*

Almost every variety of opinion prevails among modern unbelievers. This I learn from your papers, books, lectures, and conversation. While some profess to have no belief in God, others seem to entertain correct notions of the universal Father. While some pretend to have no faith that such a person as Jesus Christ ever lived, others consider him either an imposter or an enthusiast. While some hold to a future state of righteous retribution, others have no expectation of another life. While some consider the soul material and mortal, others regard it as spiritual and immortal. While some condemn the Scriptures as a forgery and an imposition, others suppose they were written generally by the persons whose names they bear. While some confound all moral distinctions and ridicule virtue and vice as mere unmeaning words, others bestow no small praise on the code of Christian morals. Many are unable to make any clear statement either of what they believe or disbelieve. If they can put down the Bible, the Sabbath, and the ministry, their object would be accomplished. In short, there is no agreement in sentiment whatsoever among unbelievers.

2. There are various degrees of education among modern unbelievers. In this section of our country, infidelity is principally confined to individuals of very moderate information. Some of the number must be ranked among the most igno-

rant; while others have obtained a smattering of the ancient languages, and a superficial acquaintance with some of the sciences. With these small attainments, they are able to make considerable impression on the minds of the unlettered. In all New England I do not know a person of thorough education and a truly virtuous character who is willing to be called an infidel. As we proceed south and west, the case is somewhat different. Although in those regions many of the least educated belong to your party, there are also some of the better educated. The latter have never given their attention to Christianity itself or to its evidences. They have heard and read sentiments which believers pronounced evangelical, and these they have unhesitatingly rejected as cruel and irrational. Whenever liberal and correct views of religion have been presented for their acceptance, they have given them a cordial welcome. If we are but faithful to Christianity, many of this number will cease to be ranked among the opposers of revealed truth.

3. There is likewise a great variety of character among unbelievers. Many have received their education under Christian influences. The virtues they have imbibed from early instruction and from Christian example remain in some vigour. Others, again, have no moral principle to deter them from iniquity. Public opinion is their standard of duty. So long as they can gain property and secure popularity, they remain contented. If we take into the account, as we ought, in making this estimate, all who denounce religion, we shall include a multitude of the most abandoned. For whoever knows anything of this subject and is willing to acknowledge the truth, must admit that a very large proportion, if not the whole body, of profligates and criminals, are secret or open unbelievers. Their want of conformity to the requisitions of that gospel which they condemn is the sole cause of their vice and wretchedness. I mention this merely as a well-known fact, and not as an unmanly taunt. In my own mind I have no doubt that infidelity naturally and necessarily tends to sin and misery in this world. This is the uniform testimony of all experience.

4. It is impossible to form any correct estimate of the number of unbelievers in our country. For in the first place, they have not organized themselves into societies, and have never published any statistics of their party. They have, indeed, occasionally boasted of the spread of their views, but in many instances without foundation. In the second place,

a change is constantly going on in their ranks; for either some religious excitement, or some affliction, or some examination of evidence, or some view of the pernicious effects of unbelief, is constantly bringing individuals back to the Christian fold. Judging from considerable personal observation and much inquiry, I think that some Christians have magnified their strength far beyond the truth, while others have gone to the opposite extreme. There have always been more or fewer unbelievers in every Christian land. Sometimes they have found it politic to keep silence and pass for Christians, and at others, they have found no inconvenience in declaring their infidelity. This is peculiarly the case at the present moment. Freedom of opinion and speech is enjoyed by all classes; and since every religionist may state and defend his belief, the irreligious exercise the same right with the greater confidence and security. I rejoice that they have thrown off their disguise, and taken their stand as anti-christians. We now know our opposers, and can adapt our teachings to their necessities.

Such, unbelievers, is a brief statement of facts respecting the nature, causes, and occasions of infidelity. Their correctness will not be doubted by those who know themselves and the religious condition of those around them. My way is now prepared for a more direct examination of your modes of reasoning.

B. Whitman.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

A Dissertation on Native Depravity. By G. Spring, D. D.

It is known to most of our readers that Dr. Spring is pastor of the Brick Presbyterian Church in the city of New York. He considers himself a "consistent and thorough-going Calvinist." He has made an octavo pamphlet of ninety-three pages on the subject of Native Depravity. His object in this book appears to be two-fold: first, to controvert the theory "advocated at New

Haven and Andover;" and second, to state and defend the old Calvinistic doctrine as he understands it. From this publication we learn several facts of importance respecting the progress of truth. A few of the most prominent we shall extract for the information of our readers. From the following quotations it will be seen how the Orthodox doctrine of depravity has been discarded by some of the most distinguished men of the denomination: —

"The first assault upon the doctrine of Native Depravity was from the New Haven school, and in their own covered way to the field. Some few ministers of the gospel, in high standing, and hitherto supposed to be attached to the doctrines of the Reformation, began to speak with an indefiniteness and looseness on this subject, to which they had not been accustomed. They were not prepared either to defend or deny; but their minds seemed to be in a state of painful hesitation. *They could not tell;* they did not know, what the Bible taught in relation to the native character of our fallen race. Ask them whether men are born sinners, and they would tell you, *We do not know.* Ask them whether infants possess any moral character, and they would reply, *We do not know.* Ask them whether they are accountable beings, and they would tell you, *We do not know.* Ask them whether they need the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, and they answered, *We do not know.* Ask them what becomes of infants when they die, and they said, *We do not know.* Ask them whether death in relation to infants is by sin, and they will say, *We do not know.*

"But this period of hesitation and skepticism has gone by. The scriptural doctrine of Native Depravity is now boldly denied. Plain and palpable efforts are now made in a number of reviews of the works of Bellamy, Edwards, and Dwight, the design of which is to set aside their views on this and other kindred doctrines. For a considerable time past, it has been unhesitatingly maintained, that all mankind are born destitute of moral character, and are neither holy nor sinful; that though they are destitute of original righteousness, they are free from sin, and have no moral corruption of nature or propensity to evil; that they are perfectly innocent; that they have no more moral character than animals; and that they come into existence in the same state in which Adam was before his fall, and in which the holy child Jesus was when he was born in the manger." — pp. 3 – 5.

This is sufficiently explicit. We are very glad to learn from so good authority that the distinguished Professors at New Haven and Andover have at last adopted our views on this important subject. But how do these gentlemen explain those passages of Scripture which have usually been quoted by Calvinists in support of the old doctrine of depravity? Let Dr. Spring answer: —

"Their exposition of them symbolizes with the exposition which has always been given by writers of the Pelagian, Arminian, and Unitarian schools. Turnbull, Taylor, Whitby, Priestley, Belsham,

and Ware, have no controversy with the theology of New Haven, or the Biblical Professor at Andover, so far as it respects the instructions of God's Holy Word in relation to the doctrine of Native Depravity. We have deeply regretted this, and tremble for the ark of God, exposed as it is to this unhallowed temerity. But it is well, perhaps, that some gentlemen are throwing off the mask, and avowing their Pelagian and Arminian sentiments." — pp. 33, 34.

This is also good news. It is a cheering thought that Andover, New Haven, and Cambridge are united on the important subject of human depravity. May the time be near when the views of the Professors shall also coïncide in relation to the nature of God and his Son. But is Dr. Spring willing to remain united with his heretical brethren? Hear his own remarks in answer: —

"To me it appears that this and kindred doctrines ought to draw a dividing line between ministers and churches. Nor is the church safe without this division. Much as I mourn over the fact in one view, in another I rejoice at it. Though I have seen enough of a divisive spirit to bewail divisions; though I have peculiar reasons to lament it; though I have many a time said, with the prophet, 'Wo is me, my mother, that thou hast borne me a man of strife!' and though I love old attachments and old friends; I may not consult considerations of this sort, at the expense of material and fundamental truth. I sigh for union and peace in God's long disjointed and contending heritage, but not with the loss of this cardinal doctrine of his word. It would be criminally deceitful to profess to unite with men and measures whose views and influence obviously tend to obscure the truth and retard the advancement of the Redeemer's cause. The unwearied assiduity with which this error is diffused calls for wakeful effort. And, if I mistake not, the *spirit* with which it is disseminated is indicative, vainly indicative, of triumph. I regret to say that it is a bold and vaunting spirit, and has treated the doctrine of Native Depravity and other kindred doctrines as though they were some latent part of mystical Babylon, which must *certainly* and *soon* come down. Let ministers and churches look about them. Let them read and investigate. And let him that readeth understand. Let the ministers of our own beloved but bleeding church, especially, stand firm and erect in their defence of the truth of God and their attachment to our invaluable standards; let Presbyteries be firm and faithful; let all watch and pray for more of the spirit of their divine Master; and unless he designs to bring upon us days of deep darkness, these moral pollutions, which already begin to corrupt our revivals and lead away our youthful professors, will soon disappear." — pp. 83, 84.

This is certainly consistent with Orthodox usage, to call a man a heretic the moment he rejects one article of the human creed or "invaluable standards," and exclude him from Christian fellowship. But what influence have these rational and scriptural views of depravity exerted on the Orthodox churches? Hear the testimony of Dr. Spring: —

"It was with the denial of this doctrine that the errors of the once evangelical churches in New England began. Let the history of

Unitarianism in Boston and Cambridge, and the history of this controversy, as it has been developed in the Christian Spectator, published at New Haven, be our comment on this remark. Let the history of the Christian church in all ages speak, and it will speak the same language. Wherever the doctrine of Native Depravity has been denied or called in question, there all the discriminating doctrines of the gospel are or soon will be loosely taught, and a kind of religion prevail very diverse from the religion of our fathers, and, as we judge, from the religion of the Bible. We know this suggestion is indignantly repelled. But facts are stubborn things. I have taken not a little pains to ascertain the state of vital piety and the character of the revivals of religion in those churches and institutions where this error prevails, and the result is a thorough conviction that the error is fraught with mischievous consequences to the souls of men. This single doctrine of Native Depravity will be found to lie near the basis of all the differences between Pelagians and Arminians, on the one hand, and consistent and thorough-going Calvinists, on the other."

Is this the very fact? We dare not deny the assertions of one who has taken so much pains to ascertain the truth on this subject.

We have not room for further quotations on these points, but must hasten to give a brief notice of the very peculiar belief of our author. What, then, is the theory of Dr. Spring respecting Native Depravity? I will present his own language:—

"Every child of Adam is a *sinner*, and from the moment he becomes a child of Adam. He may not be a sinner in the eye of men, but he is a sinner at heart and in the sight of God. . . . He is, at the instant of his creation, capable of possessing a moral character; and is, from his nature, a moral and accountable being, under a law which he either obeys or transgresses. If his moral feelings are not right, they are wrong; and if he is not a holy and virtuous being, he is a sinner."

"By the wise appointment of a righteous God, this primitive sin [of Adam] constituted all his posterity sinners. When he fell, prospectively considered they fell; and from the moment of his apostacy, the entire race, of every age and every condition, down to the last infant that should be born on earth, rose up to the view of the Divine mind as lost and ruined by their iniquity. Such is the condition to which the first apostacy introduced the race."

"There are several texts which are supposed to teach the opposite doctrine, and distinctly to affirm the *innocence of infants*. But is it so? I affirm, confidently, there is not one in all the Bible! . . . God is not bound in *justice* to save them; and whether he saves the whole or a part, he saves them as a matter of mere mercy, through the blood of his Son. . . . They are born in sin. They partake of the same sinning, corrupt nature with their parents. From the crowns of their heads to the soles of their feet, they are full of wounds and bruises and putrefying sores, that have not been bound up, nor mollified with ointment. Their hearts are full of evil, and in them there dwelleth no good thing. They are estranged, from the womb; they go astray as soon as they are born, speaking lies. Their poison is like the poison of a serpent. It is as natural for them to sin as it is

for the sting of a serpent to be poisonous. They are under the wrath and curse of God, and there is no redemption for them but through the propitiation of his only Son. What spectacle is more affecting than an immortal being entering upon its only probation with such a character? Every time you look upon a little child or a sleeping infant, you see — what? An apostate sinner; man fallen; human nature in ruins. When you clasp your fond babes to your bosom, well may solicitude and compassion find a dwelling within your heart. With all these lineaments of intelligence and of beauty and amiableness, they are dead in sin. That warm heart that trembles and beats at your side beats iniquity and death." — pp. 10, 17, 19, 34, 52, 87.

And these are the little children whom Jesus took in his arms and blessed! and said, "Of such is the kingdom of God!" But to proceed.

"All sin, whether in infants or adults, is without excuse. Who will say that sinful emotions in an infant mind are not criminal? Who has not felt that he ought to be more deeply humbled before God for having been a sinner from his birth? An enlightened conscience never originated the excuse that men are less guilty because their guilt commenced with their existence. For one, I have no such refuge, no such cause for self-gratulation and self-complacency, that the time was when I was not a sinner. Nor is my Native Depravity my misfortune merely, but my fault. Sure I am that I stand condemned at the bar of God for my Native Depravity. Every sin deserves God's wrath and curse, both in this life and that which is to come." — p. 87.

We trust we have given sufficient quotations to satisfy our readers. We could present many more, equally revolting and horrid, not to say irrational and unscriptural. We have no disposition to controvert this novel theory. The Professors at New Haven and Andover will attend to this business. An answer to the Dissertation is already announced, which we shall endeavour to obtain and notice. It is well to know what our Orthodox brethren are doing among themselves.

B. Whitman.

A Discourse on Education. Delivered before the Legislature of the State of Indiana. By Andrew Wylie, D. D.

Dr. Wylie is president of Bloomington College, in the state of Indiana. He was removed from Washington College in Pennsylvania to this situation about five years since. He was then regarded by all denominations as the ablest Presbyterian divine west of the mountains. He was invited by the joint Committee on Education of the two Houses to deliver a discourse

on this subject before the Legislature. His performance gave very general satisfaction, and by a vote of the House of Representatives two thousand copies were published, and distributed throughout the state. At the time of its delivery there were many complaints concerning the religious opinions of the author. He was accused by the more rigid of several sects of being a Unitarian, of preaching nothing but Christian morals, of keeping back the essential doctrines of the gospel. Let us see how he addressed the assembled wisdom of Indiana on the subject of religion.

"We have seen already that morals should be taught in our public seminaries. Now morals have ever been considered as standing in close and intimate connexion with religion; and did time permit us farther to pursue our analysis of the principles and laws of human nature, we might easily show that man is constitutionally formed by nature to be religious. He is a religious being, in the same sense that he is a sentient or a rational being. His senses sometimes deceive; yet still he is sentient. Reason may mislead him; yet he is rational. So his religion may be wrong; yet he is religious. Some men have professed, and no doubt very honestly attempted, to disbelieve their senses; but nature proved too strong for them, and compelled them to submit, in practice, to the government of that evidence which, in theory, they denied. Others have attempted to reject all kind of religious belief; but with as little success. Wherever there is an appetite, it must have food; and the mind will cleave to error rather than to blank nothing. A mysterious and awful impression of an overruling Power has been found in the minds of all men. This impression is the elemental principle of all religion; and ought to be cherished and directed, that is to say, educated, not destroyed.

"But here lies the difficulty. Our population is divided into sects almost as distinct as the regions whence they came; and I am compelled to add, that between these sects there does not seem to exist, I will not say, that entire *harmony* which ought to characterize the followers of Him who wished those only to be recognised as his disciples who should be distinguished by their mutual love, but even that degree of *forbearance* which we look for among all men who are not actually engaged in a state of war. Ranged under the names of their respective parties, they seem to vie with each other in illiberality, bigotry, and mutual hatred. Yet they all rail against infidelity! How inconsistent! For if what they *act* (for I care not for a mere profession,) be Christianity, I should like to know what harm there is in being an infidel, or how much farther a man removes himself from the love and favour of God by adopting the belief that he is not bound to hate, vilify, and calumniate his fellow for not belonging to the same religious party with himself. I do not mean to insinuate that this rancorous spirit of sectarian zeal is more prevalent here than elsewhere; but where it does exist among us, I perceive it goes to greater lengths and exists in a state of more vigorous activity. This is easily accounted for. This region is considered as *vacant space*, and all are in haste to occupy it, each sect with its own peculiar tenets, before it shall be occupied by others. For sectarianism has a very strong propensity to propagate itself. Urged by this procreative instinct, it is perpetually seeking where it may deposit its seminal

principles, which future care may cherish into life; and nothing exasperates it so much as to be baffled in these attempts.

"Now there is no better or surer preventive of the many evils which flow from the prevalence of this vile and odious spirit than to give to morality and religion their proper place in a system of liberal public instruction. If you would exclude little ideas from the mind, fill it with great ones. If you would furnish your sons with proper conceptions of the character of God, give them the capacity to view his works. If you would teach them what true religion is, send them direct to the Bible, qualified and prepared to hold over its sacred pages the lights of literature and science. If you would not have them dogmatical and obstinate in their opinions, let them know how *others* have thought and reasoned. In short, if you would have them preserved from every illiberal bias, and made gentlemen, Christians, and valuable members of society, store their minds with useful knowledge; let them become conversant, as far as practicable, with the whole round of science. Then will they see how confined are the bounds of human knowledge, compared with the infinitude of things which lie beyond, and be modest; then will they contemplate the stupendous grandeur of that almighty ONE, who made all things and with whom are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, and be humble; and then will they learn the weakness of human nature, and be more ready to make allowances than to censure and condemn.

"The opinion seems to be entertained by some, that because there are so many different notions on the subject of religion, and because there is found so much of bigotry and illnature connected with these notions in the practice of those who entertain them, the safest way would be to banish all religion entirely from our schools and seminaries of learning. But would this be practicable? Would it be desirable? 'Sectarianism!' cries one; 'our youth will be corrupted by sectarianism!' But who are you that give the alarm? Have *you* no religious opinions? 'Yes; but ours are right and all others wrong.' Modest enough. But others will say the same in turn; and there is no infallible pope to decide between you. 'Let us have no opinions on religion, then,' exclaims another. And who shall be the teachers, and what books shall be read? 'Such as are in favour of no opinions.' Then they must be blank books, and blank teachers. 'Be it so. Let atheists be our professors.' What! an atheist teach astronomy? or chemistry? or mental philosophy? The stars in their course would fight against him; the gases would prove him mad; the economy of the human faculties would convict him an idiot. The thing is impossible. All men, consequently all teachers, have their opinions on religion. And something on the subject, directly or indirectly, will be taught. But if it were practicable, would it be desirable for young men to be educated without religion? Shall no prayers be offered in their hearing to the Father of Lights? Shall the Saviour of the world receive no homage from the young? His heavenly doctrine no commendation from their instructers? Shall we quote Socrates, and not Paul? Demosthenes, and not Isaiah? Pindar, and not David? Seneca, and not Jesus? The public may say so, if it please them; but when they do, the day and date of the prohibition will be the day and date of the country's doom. Is there no middle course? Certainly there is. Let our youth be taught to fear God and keep his commandments; but let their teachers be enlightened, liberal-minded men, men of science, and they will find employment

enough for themselves and their pupils on congenial subjects, and be under no temptation to lead them into the dark and thorny wilderness of mystical theology.

"When many foolish and disgusting practices become connected with the outward forms of religion, or when many trivial and doubtful tenets are magnified into articles of faith, there will be, of course, abundant matter for disputation; and one of the worst consequences attending such a state of things is, that, while the unreflecting many attach great importance to trifles, others will be tempted to discard the whole. For when truth and error, things grave and things ludicrous, are blended together, it is easier at once to throw *all* overboard than to separate the one from the other. This, then, if I mistake not, is the danger of the times. Thus, because some observe one day sacred, and some another, others are for having no Sabbath; because some are bigoted, others will be skeptical; because it cannot be agreed among the different sects whose creed is the best, others are for discarding all creeds; and in the matter of education, because all cannot perfectly coincide on all points of religious doctrine, it is thought best by many that there should be no points. I will quarrel with no man about his religious belief; yet I very much question the prudence and policy as well as the propriety of such a course. One man prefers beef, another pork; one cabbage, another potatoes. Shall I, therefore, eat nothing? Of the different roads leading to a given point, it is disputed which is best. Shall I, therefore, take neither? One of my neighbours lives in a brick house; another prefers a frame. Shall I, therefore, live out of doors? Shall I advocate anarchy, till politicians have determined what sort of government is to be preferred? In all these cases men uniformly decide that something is better than nothing. And in religion, it is surely better to have some error than no truth. Only let us be careful not to impose *our* views of truth upon others. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind; but let him not cherish such prejudices against those who differ from him as preclude the exercise of charity, and lead to the calling of hard names, misrepresentations, and every species of unreasonable opposition. No man who gives himself up to such a spirit can be a real Christian, however confident he may be in his pretensions and the soundness of his experience. And were the alternative proposed to my choice, whether to stand at the final and decisive judgment which awaits us all, in the condition of such a Christian, or in that of the moderate infidel, who takes his views of duty and of the character and government of God from nature alone, I should unhesitatingly prefer the latter. For, whatever may be the fate of such an infidel, such an illnatured Christian as can allow no mercy for others need expect none for himself. Yet, in guarding against bigotry and sectarianism, let us beware of the opposite extreme, that of laying aside the great and fundamental doctrines of revealed religion. The sanctions of moral duty which are discoverable by the light of nature alone have but little practical influence on the philosopher, and none at all on the multitude. The urgency of present temptation is too powerful for the abstract reasoning of the mere moralist. Conscience would be but a feeble monitor, if men could silence the thunders of Sinai; and the tribunal of feeble opinion would be both corrupted and despised, were it not for that more awful tribunal which is erected at the entrance of another world. The sword, too, of the civil magistrate would interpose an unavailing obsta-

cle in the way of the transgressor, were it not for that almighty Arm which holds the thunderbolt, ready to be launched against the head of the guilty. Besides, who would care to struggle through the thousand difficulties which beset the path of virtue, and forego the present advantages which not seldom are found on the side of vice, were he not cheered and supported by the thought that he is not left alone in a world forsaken of God, but that He is the witness of his conduct, and will compensate his losses and reward his labours at the resurrection of the just? For my part, fellow-citizens, my mind is decided on this subject. Education without religion is worse than none; and this legislature, I thank God, are neither strong enough to compel me, nor rich enough to bribe me, to enter a seminary within whose walls religion may not find a place. I would not be understood as insinuating, by this declaration, even the slightest suspicion that there exists in this respectable body, or any member of it, a disposition such as would prompt to such a course. But I wish, on this occasion as on every other, to be candid, explicit, and unreserved." — pp. 15 – 18.

These are noble sentiments. We respect the moral courage which could present them to such an audience. And when we remember the reputed Orthodoxy of the author, and know that he is regarded as the champion of the Presbyterian denomination, we much admire their genuine liberality. His views on physical, intellectual, and moral education are equally bold, sound, and valuable. Some of our college presidents this side of the mountains might be benefited by their cordial adoption. Perhaps some may think there is a want of good taste in some of the illustrations we have quoted; but we consider such an objection as altogether out of place. If you wish to produce any effect upon an audience, you must be distinctly understood. You must not expect that refinement in an assembly of western legislators which you may find in the halls of a university. That, surely, is the best style for anad dress, which best accomplishes the purposes of the author; and we heartily wish this fundamental rule were more sacredly regarded by all public speakers.

The Bloomington College is well endowed, having lands to the amount of nearly five hundred thousand dollars; not quite one hundred thousand of which is yet productive. With such a president the institution must prove an invaluable blessing to the whole state, and even to the whole valley of the Mississippi.

B. Whitman.

Farewell Sermon. By Rev. WELLS BUSHNELL, [late Pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Meadville, Pennsylvania.]

There is nothing remarkable in the general character of this sermon, and nothing which would have led us to notice it, but for a single paragraph which it contains. This passage is somewhat curious as being a tolerably fair specimen of the manner in which the Presbyterians of the west are pleased to speak of Unitarians and Unitarianism; it may, therefore, be worth the quoting.

"I have no fear that any of you who have been born from above will ever be left to reject any of the fundamental doctrines of the gospel — such as the doctrine of the Trinity — the supreme divinity and vicarious atonement of Jesus Christ — the necessity of regeneration by the Holy Spirit, &c. No true Christian, I am well persuaded, ever rejects any of these vitally important truths of Christianity, or continues any length of time in doubts about them; yet Christians may not be as much alive to their importance as they ought to be — they may not look upon those who reject them to be in as great danger as they are actually in. . . . . Now I would solemnly warn you, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, against any kind of compromise in religious matters with those who hold and inculcate the soul-ruining sentiments to which I have just alluded. Let not the senseless cry of bigotry, intolerance, and persecution prevent you from calling that system of religion by its right name, viz., a refined kind of deism — absolute infidelity — another gospel — and, in the language of Scripture, a damnable heresy. Be assured, Unitarianism, in some of its forms, such is its adaptation to the depraved hearts of men, will gain ground among you, unless the friends of evangelical truth continue to bear their united and solemn testimony against it. Only let the sentiment become common among the Orthodox, that it is possible for Unitarians to be true Christians, and to be saved, while relying upon that system, and the mischief that will follow no tongue can tell. When that fatal hour arrives, (I pray God it may never come,) then will the glory have departed from all your churches — then will all right regard for the holy truth of God be absent, and the consequences, I hesitate not to say, will be fearful! I thank God that I have been permitted so long to bear testimony against this arch-delusion. And it is a matter of little consequence to me what verdict may be passed by some on my motives for giving this last warning and testimony against Unitarianism. I appeal from the tribunal of their judgment, *to the judgment-seat of Christ.*"

There are certain among us who will, doubtless, regard this as quite spiceless and insipid. It is sad to think that men's palates can become so depraved that nothing should have power to gratify them short of the poisoned reputation of their brethren. As for Mr. Bushnell, we are sorry that he should have felt occasion thus to appeal from human judgment as to his *motives* in defaming Unitarians; but we cannot but feel equal concern

for him in view of what we deem the certainty that his appeal will hardly avail for his acquittal from the charge of *actual* defamation, however *intended.* G. NICHOLS.

An Essay on Demoniacs. By PLAIN TRUTH.

The author of this production has not seen proper to let his name appear on the title-page. We understand, however, that it was written by a gentleman who was graduated at Andover about seven years since, and is now settled in the ministry over an Orthodox society in Connecticut. The essay consists of thirty-two closely printed duodecimo pages, and is published by the Messrs. Adams at Amherst. The writer has investigated this important subject for himself, and has dared to give the results of his inquiries to the public, although they coïncide with the views usually maintained by Unitarians. His arguments are scriptural, his style perspicuous, his reasoning conclusive, and his spirit Christian. We know of no work so well adapted for general circulation on this question, and we hope the publishers will supply our booksellers in this vicinity. One or two extracts will show some of the obstacles which a lover of truth has to encounter in this land of free inquiry.

"I have offered this essay to most of the periodicals in New England, but none of them have independence enough to publish it; and therefore I do it myself. I well know that the easiest way to public favour is to write for some party; and that it is attended with *not a little danger* for a man to think for himself, and publish what he does think, without regard to prevailing opinions. I do not expect to please any party, and shall probably be frowned upon by most. I have a higher object than to please, and that is, to establish the meaning of Scripture. If I suffer in consequence of this, I hope to take it patiently. I do not wish to occupy much of any man's time, and consequently have adopted for my motto, 'Brevity and perspicacity.'

"Professor Stuart has said that he can overthrow this essay '*as easily* as he can perform a sum in addition.' He has *promised* to do it, and I hope he will. I think, too, he is under *obligation* to do it; for, previous to 1826, he declined giving his pupils any instructions upon this subject, because he did not understand it; though now it is 'a sum in addition.'

"I have no interest in the views here presented. If they are not correct I shall rejoice in seeing the errors detected; and shall gladly relinquish any position when convinced that it is wrong."

We would recommend to Unitarian ministers to distribute this essay among their people. It contains, within a small compass, all that needs to be said on the subject; and, coming from an Orthodox minister, will not be likely to excite any fears in the minds of the most timid and wavering. B. WHITMAN.

CORRESPONDENCE AND INTELLIGENCE

[illegible] to the Editor.

[illegible]

[illegible] the people. The community has been [illegible] community a large [illegible] ground [illegible] and [illegible] power over the common [illegible] great success. While the [illegible] cause and crime the common. [illegible] when we consider that our [illegible] the motivation of Christian [illegible] something new of Christ. [illegible] we must see [illegible] *common* [illegible] religion [illegible] *more than any of us have.* I prefer [illegible] *elegance.* I only want that the [illegible] *should spring from and express a noble, generous* [illegible] *the spirit of the sublime principles* [illegible] truth and [illegible]

I hope the [illegible] of your first number, so far as I have been able to examine it. I think you could give your readers a new impulse in regard to the great object of Christian philanthropy, and that is, the regeneration of the world, the intellectual and moral elevation of the mass of the people, a deep reform in all classes of society, in all parties and sects, and a new and faithful application of Christian principles to all the relations, employment, pleasures, and duties of life. The *spirit of reformation* is what we all need to learn, practice, teach, and spread around us. The present intellectual and moral condition should be a burden and grief to us all. We want a body of Christians who will comprehend the condition and wants of society, who never have been done yet, and who will devote themselves, their hearts, time, substance, lives to its regeneration. As far as your work [illegible] this spirit it will be invaluable. Indeed, I know nothing which [illegible] so much good. I am heartily glad that you are about [illegible] which are crisis among us. This [illegible] Wishing you a divine blessing, I am [illegible]

[illegible] PENNSYLVANIA.

[illegible] Mr. [illegible] has long been [illegible] may [illegible] and [illegible] between [illegible] or [illegible] Mr. [illegible] right, [illegible] region, [illegible] To the [illegible] generous, [illegible] ef-

tainly, than to his very liberal pecuniary contributions, does the Unitarian society of Meadville, under God, owe its present prosperity, and its existence even. After several years, earnest study of the Scriptures, such as few among the clergy have ever bestowed, having become clearly convinced that the doctrines of Unitarianism were the doctrines of the Bible, he at once resolved on giving them his public testimony. Of the obloquy attending such a profession in that region, at that time, few among us have any just conception. From the pulpit and from the press a torrent of personal abuse and invective was immediately poured out upon him. That from the pulpit he sat and calmly listened to, pitying it. To that from the press he replied, by entering at once upon an exposition of the grounds of his faith, in a series of strong articles, following one upon another, week after week, through a space of many months. For a long period he stood alone. But at length the public mind, as might have been anticipated, was obliged to give way before the force of his arguments. Numbers became converted to the Unitarian faith, and soon Unitarian preaching was procured. It was not, however, until the year 1830, that constant preaching could be obtained. In the spring of that year a society was regularly organized under Rev. Mr. Peabody, since of Cincinnati. Under the auspices of Mr. Peabody, a monthly periodical was also commenced, "The Unitarian Essayist," which was supported for two years, chiefly by the contributions of the gentleman above alluded to; when it was discontinued, through want of leisure in the principal contributor — to the exceeding regret of those who were in the practice of perusing its able articles, and who knew how eagerly it was sought after through a wide circuit.

From the period of its organization to the present time, the Meadville church has continued to grow rapidly; the congregation, latterly, having usually numbered nearly two hundred; among whom, it is a cheering fact, are to be reckoned (not to speak invidiously,) *a full proportion*, at the least, of the truly intelligent and devout of the village. For some months, since the death of its late lamented minister, Rev. A. Brigham, the church has been without a pastor. We rejoice to learn, that it has, notwithstanding, continued to prosper; the pulpit having been, meantime, supplied by a reader. Within a few weeks, however, it has succeeded in engaging Rev. A. D. Wheeler as a successor to Mr. Brigham. We would remark, by the way, that Mr. Wheeler is the first to sustain the sole office of pastor to this society — his predecessors having united with this office that of tutor in the family of the gentleman above alluded to. After Mr. Brigham's decease, some difficulty having been anticipated in respect to procuring a person to fill both offices, the society resolved to obtain a pastor who should be exclusively devoted to their interests; and raised at once for this object the very liberal, and, for that region, ample salary of five hundred dollars. — We cannot too heartily commend the efforts by which this church has been established. May the example be emulated, as it deserves.

Should this notice meet the eye of the gentleman who has been alluded to as the founder of the Meadville church, we trust he will pardon the liberty we have taken. When so many, all over the country, who are of us, nevertheless, through fear of man, hesitate to avow their sentiments, and join openly with us, and this to the incalculable injury

of the cause of truth and the world's best interests, such examples are needed.

We conclude this somewhat protracted notice with a short extract from a letter, dated Meadville, Dec. 12, 1833. After some remarks respecting the general anxiety which was then felt among the people to obtain a pastor, the writer proceeds:

"I have been reading them Channing for several Sabbaths. They listen with breathless attention; it is really inspiring. There are more or less strangers present every time; they cannot resist Channing, but always come to hear the second part of a discourse. What might not a good minister do here just now!—The Sunday-school, too, is very interesting. As soon as the weather will permit we shall have meetings of the Sunday-school teachers. These little associations keep the society together, and make Unitarianism appear so interesting that there is a great curiosity among others to hear what it is, and to draw near its blaze, which they seem to quit reluctantly."

UNITARIANISM IN DETROIT.

Extract of a Letter dated Detroit, December 11th, 1833.

"Your prospectus of 'The Unitarian' came duly to hand some weeks since. Its presence was greeted by our small though devoted band, like a herald in the wilderness. Be assured it could not have come in a better time. Rev. Mr. Pierpont [of Boston] had just been among us, and the impress of his gifted mind was still vivid. You have probably heard that he was compelled to preach in the court-room of our capitol, from an unwillingness on the part of our Orthodox brethren to admit *such a heretic* into their pulpits. But discouraging as this was, and in spite of the distance from the centre of the city, he was listened to, on the first evening, by a large and attentive audience. An unfortunate mistake in regard to the public notice prevented a similar fulness on the next evening. One thing is worthy of note, Mr. Pierpont's was the *first* Unitarian sermon ever preached in Michigan. We have a paper circulating for the signatures of such as are independent enough to avow their real sentiments.

"You see I have obtained some names for your periodical. Its circulation in this community, and the consequent dissemination of the liberal principles it is intended to inculcate, will prepare the way for the organization of a Unitarian society before many months. You may be assured of my utmost exertions in its behalf. The names below are all influential ones.

"I know, and feel every day, the unpopularity of Unitarianism in the west. I am aware that in a professional point of view I gain nothing. But what is all this, contrasted with the time-serving, slavish fear that chains a man to silence, because, if he speaks, he wars with the multitude? I shall act independently, fearlessly, come what may."

So long as Unitarians are animated by such a spirit, (and, thank God! it is not rare in our infant churches,) there is nothing to fear; the truth *must* prevail.

INSTALLATION.—January 1st, Rev. A. B. Muzzey was installed as pastor of the First Congregational Society in Cambridgeport. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Briggs of Lexington.

☞ *The importance to the interests of Christianity that all movements affecting the progress of truth, wherever they may occur, should be generally known, induces the Editors earnestly to solicit the communication of articles of intelligence on this subject.*

Theological Works for sale by James Munroe and Co.

Newland's Analysis of the Thirty-nine Articles.
Burnet on do. do.
Rees's Racovian Catechism.
Farmer on the Temptation.
——— on Miracles.
——— on Demoniacs.
Marsh's Michaelis.
Jebb's Works.
Cogan's do.
Hartley on Man.
Pascal's Thoughts.
Gleig's History of the Bible.
Herder's Works.
Sparks's Tracts.
History of the Huguenots.
Boëtius's Consolations.
Burnet's History of the Reformation.
Claude's do. do.
Wardlaw on the Socinian Controversy.
Blackwall's Sacred Classics.
Waddington's Church History.
Hengstenberg's Christologie.
Griesbachii Symbolæ Criticæ.
Calmet's Dictionary of the Bible, 4to.
Ernesti's Institutes of Interpretation.
Le Clerc, Ars Critica.
Jenning's Jewish Antiquities.
Jahn's Archæology.
——— Hebrew Commonwealth.
Fleury's Manners and Customs of the Israelites.
Burder's Oriental Customs.
Cudworth's Intellectual System.
Campbell on Revelation.
Michaelis, Hebrew Bible.
Hahn, do. do.
Diodati's Bible,
Castalio's do.
Greek Septuagint.
Antwerp Polyglott.
Latin Vulgate.
Wetstein, Novum Testamentum.
Knapp, do. do.
Griesbach, do. do.
Beausobre and L'Enfant, New Testament
Bloomfield's Critical Digest of the New Testament.
Bowyer's Critical Conjectures on do.
Eichhorn, Old and New Testament.
Patrick and Lowth's Commentary on the Sacred Scriptures.
Wells's do. do.
Kuinoel, Comment. New Testament.
Rosenmüller, do. do.
Do. do. Old Testament.
Gesenius on Isaiah.
Taylor on Romans.
Wakefield on Matthew.
Porteus on do.
Blayney's Jeremiah.
Trollope's Analecta Sacra.
Macknight on the Epistles.
Gillies' New Testament.
Lowman on Revelation.
Jahn's Introduction to Old Testament.
Carpenter's do. to Sacred Scriptures.
Hug's do. to New Testament.
Simon's Hebrew Lexicon.
Gesenius, do. do.
Schleusner, Lexicon to New Testament.
Biel's Thesaurus.
Schmidt's Concordance to the Greek Testament.
Buxtorf's Hebrew Concordance.
Theological Repository.
General Repository.
Christian Disciple, Old and New Series.
Do. Examiner, Old and New Series.
Unitarian Miscellany.
Do. Advocate.
Biblical Repository.
Scriptural Interpreter.

NEW BOOKS JUST RECEIVED.

Washington's Writings.
Porter's Lectures on Homeletics.
Channing's Discourses. 3d ed.
Memoir of Roger Williams.
Bryant's Poems. New edition, with Additions.
Sermons on Christian Morality. By W. J. Fox.
Life of Grant Thorburn.
Select Library. Vol. 1. Lord Bacon's Essays.
Diary of an Ennuyee.
Herschell's Treatise on Astronomy, with Plates.
Story's Constitutional Class-Book.
Select Works of James Sheridan Knowles.
Malcolm on Marriage.
Owen's Treatise on the Sabbath.
Memoir of John Cotton.
Martineau's Devotional Exercises.
Paige's Selections from Eminent Commentators.
Dr. Combe on Mental Derangement.
Review of the late Revolution in Europe, by C. Cushing, 2 vols.
Winslow on the Trinity.

THE UNITARIAN is issued in monthly numbers, by JAMES MUNROE and Co., *Cambridge, Mass.* Each number will contain, on an average, 48 pages royal 12mo., [i. e. octavo size], and be printed on good paper and with handsome type. The price will be two dollars per annum, payable on the first of March. To those who procure six subscribers a seventh copy will be furnished *gratis*. The usual discount to Agents. All letters and communications to be addressed to the publishers.

Our Subscribers are reminded that payment becomes due on the receipt of this number. Gentlemen to whom subscription-papers were sent are respectfully requested to collect and forward to the publishers, James Munroe & Co., Cambridge, Mass., the amount due from the several subscribers whose names they have sent us.

Our general list of Agents will be published as soon as it can be completed.

It is our intention to notice all the books and pamphlets which we may receive, so far as they fall within the plan of our work. We would, therefore, respectfully request authors and publishers to forward to us copies of such publications.

The Editors will hold themselves responsible for no articles except their own.

JAMES MUNROE AND CO.,

Booksellers to the University,

are Publishers of the following works:—

Apocrypha, 8vo.
Butler's Works, 2 vols.
——— Analogy.
Bowring's Matins and Vespers.
Cicero's Complete Works. 20 vols.
Cummings's New Testament.
——— Questions on the Gospels.
Economy of Human Life.
Griesbach's Greek Testament.
Hildreth's Lives of the Apostles.
Hartley's Prayers.
Holmes's American Annals.
Locke on St. Paul's Epistles.
Memoirs of Oberlin, with an Introductory Essay by Rev. Henry Ware, Jr.
Norton's Statement of Reasons for not believing the Doctrines of Trinitarians.
Noyes's Job.
Paley's Complete Works, 6 vols.
——— Natural Theology, with Paxton's Illustrations.
Peirce's History of Harvard College.
Robert Robinson's Sermons.
Selections from the Scriptures.
Theological Common-Place Book.
The Complete Works of Dugald Stewart, 7 vols.
Tucker's Light of Nature, 4 vols.
Worcester on the Atonement.
——— Friendly Review.
——— Last Thoughts on Important Subjects.
Whately's Rhetoric.
Whitman's Letters to a Universalist.
Ware on the Formation of the Christian Character.
Watson's Apology for the Bible.
Ware's Sunday Library.
Vol. 1, containing The Life of the Saviour, by Rev. Henry Ware, Jr.
Vol. 2, containing The Life of Howard the Philanthropist, by Mrs. John Farrar.

NEW BOOKS JUST RECEIVED.

Bryant's Poems. New edition, with Additions.
Channing's Discourses. 3d ed.
Combe on Mental Derangement.
Combe's Elements of Phrenology, 2d edition, with engravings.
Diary of an Ennuyee.
English Common-Law Reports, vol. 23.
Fanaticism. By the Author of the Natural History of Enthusiasm.
Good's Book of Nature, abridged, with Questions, for the use of Schools. Illustrated by numerous Cuts.
Herschell's Treatise on Astronomy, with Plates.
Library of Entertaining Knowledge, No. 43.
Life of Grant Thorburn.
Malcolm on Marriage.
Martineau's Devotional Exercises.
Memoir of Roger Williams.
Memoir of John Cotton.
Memoirs of Marshal Ney. Published by his Family.
Milton's Poetical Works, a new edition, with a Life of the Author, by Rev. J. Mitford, 2 vols. 8vo.
Nuttall's Ornithology of the United States and Canada. Water Birds.
Owen's Treatise on the Sabbath.
Paige's Selections from Eminent Commentators.
Penny Magazine, No. 7, Boston Edition.
Do. Do. No. 17, London Edition.
Porter's Lectures on Homiletics.
Review of the late Revolutions in Europe, by C. Cushing, 2 vols.
Select Library. Vol. 1. Lord Bacon's Essays.
Select Works of James Sheridan Knowles.
Sermons on Christian Morality. By W. J. Fox.
Story's Commentaries on the Conflict of Laws.
Story's Constitutional Class Book.

THE UNITARIAN.

VOL. I. MARCH 1, 1834. No. 3.

Christianity a Universal Religion.

"The field is the world." — *Jesus Christ.*

The founders of ancient religious systems were contented if they could procure the allegiance of single nations, and seem to have considered their systems strictly national, — not as fitted for universal adoption. Jesus Christ first developed the noble plan of a universal religion. And we cannot but regard it as one of the strongest proofs of the divinity of his mission, that, while this grand conception appears never to have entered the mind of any ancient philosopher, statesman, or priest, it should have inspired the soul and directed the unremitted labours of a poor and illiterate peasant in an obscure and unenlightened corner of Asia. This idea of uniting all men as to their highest and most permanent interests, too vast, too majestically simple for the human mind, we are irresistibly led to attribute to divine wisdom. God, through Christ, has promulgated a system of religion which he designs for men of all nations and ages, and which, we think, must on examination commend itself as perfectly adapted to its purpose, — and not only so, but as the only known religion which is fitted to become universal. We propose to point out some of those characteristics of Christianity which adapt it for universality, and which authorize the hope that it will one day subject all the kingdoms of the world to the Redeemer's sceptre.

I. The first characteristic of Christianity which we shall mention is its adaptation to human nature.

The founders of other religions have proceeded upon the presumption that all is not right in human nature, — that

all man's innate appetites and propensities are not equally innocent, — that not only his own evil creations, but a great part of his Creator's work is to be undone. Thus, some systems have required the mortification of the flesh, by renouncing the gratification of those appetites which were implanted for the preservation of our being; others, the surrender of domestic and social pleasures in themselves innocent and even virtuous; others, the confinement and degradation of that mind to which God has assigned no field narrower than immensity, no limit short of his own eternity. Now Christianity attempts no such change. It takes human nature as it came from the hands of the Creator, and recognises all its appetites, instincts, propensities, and powers as good in themselves and adapted to the production of good. It aims not to defeat, but to promote, the healthful developement of every principle of our nature, It establishes an equilibrium and a mutual subordination among all its constituent portions. It does for it the same service that is performed for the vegetable world by the united influence of the earth, the sun, and the shower, which do not pervert, but aid and complete, the designs of nature.

Man is an animal being. He has appetites and functions which fit him for a residence in the material world and the enjoyment of material pleasures. Christ does not require the reckless renunciation of these pleasures, and of their medium, the body. He barely enjoins temperance, which is, in fact, the dictate, the demand, of nature. For without it health cannot be preserved; without it the zest of novelty must soon be lost; without it a temporary cessation of sensual enjoyment is misery. And Christ has farther shown himself the friend of human nature by assigning to the body, with its appetites, functions, and pleasures, its appropriate rank and sphere of usefulness. He has taught us that the body is the appointed means of spiritual discipline and improvement, inferior to the mind in dignity, subject to its control, unessential to its existence or its happiness. He thus attaches to it that relative value which will prompt his disciples to seek its gratifications without inordinate anxiety, to enjoy them temperately, and to forego or resign them cheerfully. He thus makes it subservient to the developement and cultivation of man's intellectual and moral powers, and therefore the means of attaining more dignified and purer enjoyments than those of which a merely sentient being is susceptible. Thus is Christianity perfectly adapted to man's animal nature.

Again, man is a social being. He is born a member of society, with numerous social connexions and interests. He is endowed with social affections and sympathies. Christ does not demand the abandonment of society, the dissolution of those bonds which connect us with our brethren, and a monastic seclusion from those whose friendship makes our joy. He, on the other hand, aids the designs of nature, by multiplying common interests, by cutting off the sources of jealousy and alienation, and subjecting social intercourse to the comprehensive law of universal love. He bids us regard each other, not as cotenants of the earth, but as coheirs of heaven, — not as fellow-travellers for a few days, but as companions for eternity, — not as strangers casually connected, but as children of the same Father. He shows us that those distinctions of rank and fortune, which are so apt to alienate men from each other, are not and from their nature cannot be essential; that, with respect to their far-reaching and all-important relations with God and eternity, the king and his meanest subject, the proprietor of millions and the beggar at his gate, are on the same level. He spreads over those sins, which are so apt to alienate us from our brethren, the mantle of charity. He establishes self-love as the measure of brotherly love. And, finally, he forbids us to look to death as the termination of our social relations; but gives us reason to hope that those friendships which Christian love here cements, will be formed anew and cherished forever in the light of God's countenance. Now it is undeniable that the interruption of our social connexions, while our social sympathies and wants remain, is one of the most fruitful sources of human misery; and that our nature demands some bond of union over which space, time, sin, and death can have no power. This bond we have seen that Christianity supplies, and it is therefore adapted to man as a social being.

Further, man is an intellectual being. He has powers which qualify him for the acquisition of knowledge and the investigation of truth. Christ does not repress the efforts of mental power, and chain the mind down to a few beggarly elements of knowledge or to an implicit faith in a few unintelligible propositions. He, on the other hand, supplies the wants of the mind. By making the body subservient to it, he removes the chief obstacles to its improvement, and furnishes it with an active and effective instrument for the acquisition of knowledge and strength. He regulates those

violent passions which disturb the equilibrium of the intellect, and thus render it incapable of systematic or permanent effort. He concentrates all the energies of the soul on the noblest, the most fruitful, the most interesting objects. He presents the great truths which relate to the spirit, to God, and to eternity, as the subjects of contemplation and investigation; and (as the mind cannot but partake in some degree of the attributes of its usual topics of thought,) he forms it to an ever-increasing resemblance to its divine Source and Prototype. Where do we behold greater mental power or higher mental elevation than in St. Paul? But we have no reason to suppose his intellectual endowments thus preeminent, when he was a zealous persecutor of the church of Christ. He gives us the secret of his greatness, when he says, "This one thing I do: forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things which are before, I press towards the mark, for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." "*This one thing I do.*" It was this concentration of purpose and effort for a noble and worthy object that added strength and vigour to his mind. And since his day, who have displayed the greatest mental power? Has it not been Christian patriots, philanthropists, and martyrs? And why has it been so? Simply because, whatever they have done, they have had constantly before them one prime object of pursuit, to which they have immediately or indirectly consecrated all their powers and efforts, — because they have had the noblest themes of contemplation, the highest sphere of duty, the strongest motives to vigorous and persevering exertion. And if Christianity thus developes, concentrates, and perfects the powers of the mind, it is surely adapted to man as an intellectual being.

Finally, man is a moral being. He is capable of choosing for himself a standard of action, and of regulating his conduct by it. Christ does not confound moral distinctions, and content himself with requiring mental assent to his doctrines or the mechanical performance of unmeaning ceremonies. He establishes a safe and immutable standard of action, that is, the will of God as made known by nature, Providence, and revelation. This is a test by which we have the means of trying every moral quality, habit, and action. For God has not left himself without a witness in nature; the course of his Providence distinctly shows what modes of conduct meet his approbation, and what, his displeasure; and the commands and prohibitions of his revealed word extend to every department

of human life. Christ has also sanctioned this standard of action, by showing that adherence to it is the means of obtaining true, permanent, eternal happiness, while he who departs from it sins against his nature, his happiness, his soul. And, above all, he has given the heart-stricken penitent the hope of pardon and acceptance from a Father who receives from his frail children contrition and sincerity in lieu of perfect obedience. Now what man, in a moral point of view, most needed was a perfect, immutable, universal standard of action, such moral sanctions as should make virtue every man's highest interest, and the hope of pardon for past offences upon repentance and reformation. And Christianity, by supplying this standard, these sanctions, this blessed hope, evinces its adaptation to man's moral nature.

Thus have we seen that Christianity is alike adapted to man's nature and wants as a sensual, social, intellectual, and moral being. But human nature is one and the same everywhere; it everywhere exhibits the same frailties and feels the same wants. And therefore Christianity, so far as regards its adaptation to that nature, and its power of remedying those frailties and supplying those wants, is fitted to become a universal religion.

But in an inquiry of this kind, we should consider the circumstances in which man is placed as well as his abstract nature. And this leads us to remark,

II. Secondly, that Christianity is fitted to become a universal religion, because it is adapted to all the varieties of external situation in which man can be placed.

The fanciful systems of Greek and Roman mythology could be embraced only by a nation of painters, sculptors, and architects. The loathsome objects of Egyptian reverence none but a resident of Egypt could worship. The Hindoo must live near enough to the Ganges to wash in its purifying stream, or he lives and dies in his sins. The worshipper of the god who requires the slaughter of flocks and herds can live only in a pastoral region; nor could a tribe of Nomades embrace a religion which demands the presentation of first-fruits or frequent libations of wine and oil. The Jewish religion commanded all its professors to appear at the temple in Jerusalem three times a year, and to maintain perpetually the daily, weekly, and annual sacrifices; and now that Jerusalem is deserted, that the temple is level with the ground, that the daily oblation has ceased, there is not a man living who, as to religion, has a right to call himself a Jew. Nor have the votaries

of these several systems ever professed to regard them as of universal design or adaptation. They have not even attributed anything like a universal supremacy to their gods. The Egyptian would not have ascribed a civil war in Italy to his pet crocodile, nor would the Roman have supposed Jupiter much concerned in a change of dynasty on the throne of the Ptolemies. The Hindoo owns Juggernaut as his country's and his own god; but thinks that a more powerful deity, even his tutelar divinity, gave to the Englishman his Indian conquests. It is doubtful whether even the ancient Jews believed their God Jehovah the only God, or whether they did not rather regard him as the greatest of gods.

But Christ revealed a God who protects and governs, not this or that nation, but all men, — a God of impartial, universal benevolence, — a God, who is everywhere present, and to whom acceptable worship may rise from every portion of the world. The simple rites which the gospel enjoins demand no peculiar soil or climate or state of society. Wherever there is a well, fountain, or river, there may the infant or the convert be initiated into the church of Christ. Wherever fellow-disciples can meet for a social repast, there may the Saviour's dying love be commemorated. Christianity enjoins no expensive or burdensome offering. The sympathizing heart and, where it can be extended, the liberal hand are its only acceptable oblations. It demands no pilgrimages, no pompous assemblies or solitary fasts. Wherever the Christian is, his God is with him, around him, within him. And whether by day or night, in the closet or the market-place, in silence or amid confusion, whenever and wherever he would offer praise or prayer, the supreme Object of praise, the Hearer of prayer will accept and answer. The gospel imposes no fatiguing and unprofitable round of ceremonies. Every man, who is industrious and faithful in his avocation, honest in his dealings, pure in his conversation, lives in the constant observance of the Christian ritual. It enjoins obedience to no difficult and complex code of laws. Its great law of love, love to God and man, all can understand, all can keep, all must keep if they would be happy. Its privileges, too, may be enjoyed by all of every nation, in every place. The divine protection is extended over all. The sun of God's favour may enlighten every mind. The influences of his spirit may pervade and sanctify every soul. The love of Jesus may be shed abroad in every heart. And wherever the Christian dies, whether on sea or on land, whether beneath

the torrid rays of the tropical sun or on the ice-bound shore of the Arctic ocean, whether in the bosom of his family or among strangers, Christ, the resurrection and the life, is waiting to receive him to heaven. In fine, the rites of Christianity may be observed, its duties discharged, and its privileges enjoyed, wherever be the home, the sojourn, or the death-bed of the believer. And this characteristic of our religion, as we have already observed, is one of those circumstances which eminently fit it to become a universal religion.

There is another important view of this subject, which must be reserved for the next number.

A. P. Peabody.

Letters from the South. No. II.

Baltimore, *Jan.* 1*st*, 1834.

Since writing to you from New York, I have extended my tour to Washington, whence I have just returned to this city. My visit to the capital, as you may suppose, was not uninteresting. I heard enough of political talk, and, above the monotonous buzz of a thousand voices, the great deposite-question was continually sounding in my ears. But as I was one of those "lookers-on in Venice," whose scanty knowledge enables them to see only the surface of things, I shall not trouble you with any crude and idle remarks on matters which *the initiated* in political science are alone at liberty to expound.

It has been my first object to discover the prospects of Unitarianism in the section of country through which I have passed. On comparing the accounts which I have received from various sources, I am compelled to say that its prospects are small — I mean regularly organized Unitarianism, as it exists at the north. Mr. Furness's congregation at Philadelphia is large — the church is full. But then the society is composed almost wholly of New-Englanders and Englishmen, who were Unitarians previously. No converts, I believe, have been made from the home-population of the city, except

a few from the liberal among the Friends. Mr. Burnap's society in this city is most respectable in its character and considerable as to its numbers, and grows slowly; but then it is principally composed of emigrants from the north. Mr. Palfrey's in Washington is a good society, but not large; and, like Mr. Furness's, is composed of New-Englanders and Englishmen. The great barrier to the reception of Unitarianism, all along, is the extreme bigotry, prejudice, and ignorance everywhere built up against it. I was prepared to find a good deal of this, but not so much as I have lately heard of. I could tell you some anecdotes to the point, which would surprise some of our friends at home, though they would not wear a strange aspect to yourself. But I shall avoid what might, perhaps, be called gossip. The great object (and it is a very difficult one to accomplish,) is to bring people within the sphere of your influence, that you may tell them what Unitarianism is; then you may do well enough. But what can you expect, when thousands of intelligent people are filled with notions of our views of Christianity, so utterly unlike the reality and so ludicrous, that you can hardly believe them to be serious when they tell them to you, and so prejudiced that a lover of music would think it quite unsafe to attend an oratorio in a Unitarian church on an evening at a reasonable distance from the Sabbath, and when the influence of an ignorant and bigoted clergy — ignorant as regards our faith — is so great? Were you to go among the Orthodox of this community, perhaps five out of every ten persons you might meet would be surprised and shocked to learn that we even profess to draw our faith from the Bible. Their only notions about us are that we are a sort of monsters, who do not believe in Jesus Christ. — A very intelligent layman, who has at heart the prosperity of the great cause of truth and righteousness, said to me to-day, "Little or nothing can be accomplished towards converting the indigenous population of the south, unless you bring the strongest minds, which perforce shall bear down all opposition; or else, preachers of a fervid eloquence, suited to the taste of the people. The cool, unimpassioned style and manner of the north will not do. It might do, perhaps, if you had people already before you. As it is, the great object is to bring them within your influence." This can be done only by a striking style, which, to use an old phrase, not, however, just what I want, "will make a noise." — Besides the causes I have mentioned, and another great one, the want of a spirit of free inquiry, I should not omit to mention fashion, which, especially as regards the young, often stands in the way of good influences.

These remarks refer to the prospects of Unitarianism as such, I mean with its *name*. But as to the doctrine of the simple unity of God, its reception is by no means so limited. There is, for instance, the large and flourishing body of the Hicksite Quakers, most of whom are to be found in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Maryland. In this city they are numerous. Then, there are the Christians and some among the smaller denominations. It is doubtful, also, whether among the Methodists the truth has not found its way to a considerable extent. I have been told that many of that sect in Baltimore are Arians. Dr. Duncan, of this city, pastor of an Independent (formerly Presbyterian) church, who is allowed on all hands to be a strong man, has written vehemently and forcibly against creeds, for which he has been denounced by many of his brethren and expelled from the presbytery. He has advocated principles for which Unitarians have long been contending, and I judge that he has come far within the pale of heresy. It is a common remark here that he is "a Unitarian in a mist." It is understood that he has given up the doctrine of the third *person* in the Trinity, the Holy Ghost, and believes only in a duality of persons in the Godhead. I may mention that it is confidently asserted of a certain Presbyterian church in Philadelphia, that its pastor and a large part of the congregation are Unitarians, and, considering the sources of my information, I am inclined to believe that there is some truth in it. It is unquestionable that there exists south of New England a great deal of Unitarianism, though it has not put on the name. The name is the great bugbear. It is supposed to cover the concentration of all that is daring and wilful in skepticism and infidelity. It deserves to be remarked, however, that Unitarian preaching has altered, in some degree, the tone of sentiment and feeling in regard to us, especially at Washington. The Orthodox clergy do not speak with quite so much ignorant dogmatism as formerly, and are beginning to learn that they must meet us with argument, and argument alone.

I heard an able lecture from Mr. Palfrey, at his Sunday-evening service last week, on the duty and methods of free inquiry. He had a very large auditory. The sermon which I heard was introductory to a course of lectures on Unitarianism, which will be advertised in the public papers, and from which much is expected. Through a letter received from Washington to-day by a friend, I learn that the lecture of last Sab-

bath, on the person of Christ, was more numerously attended than the former, and presented a convincing argument. It has never before been the society's practice to advertise lectures of this sort, and much good may come of it.

Among my recollections I must not forget to mention my visit, last week, to the Jesuits' College at Georgetown, D. C. We were received with great courtesy by Father Mulledy, the rector, who devoted the afternoon to us. I came away much gratified with what I saw and with the attention we received, and regretted that I should not be able to repeat my visit. The college is situated on the heights of Georgetown, in one of the finest positions I know. To the east and north, the ground — part of which is laid out in a garden, and on which are several neat, white edifices belonging to the college — sweeps up with fine undulations, which reminded me strongly of Mount Auburn. At the west is a beautiful view of the valley of the Potomac and a part of Washington. There are, I believe, at the college, seventeen brethren of the order who have offices of instruction and government. Many of them have been educated in the first universities of Europe. Father Mulledy is an accomplished gentleman, and has the reputation of a learned man. The number of students, most of whom are Protestants, is about one hundred and forty; it is sometimes larger. The course of instruction goes over seven years. I have heard the objection made that it is somewhat too scholastic, and not sufficiently American. Great attention is paid to the study of the classics and especially to composing and conversing in Latin. The lectures on metaphysics, logic, theology, *etc.*, are delivered in that language. To those who have advanced to this part of the course this presents no embarrassment, it is said, as they are then generally able to speak Latin with facility. Yet it struck me as a useless relic of the old mode of instruction; and I cannot but believe that it must make most subjects, especially metaphysics and theology, sufficiently dry and uninteresting to the student. At least, lectures in Latin cannot have that vigour and life, nor that delicacy of adaptation, which lectures delivered to pupils in their own language would exhibit. The library-room is a small but very elegant apartment, and contains about twelve thousand volumes, among which are [illegible] very rare and valuable books; and I saw [illegible] of which is very splendid. [illegible] among them, books con-

nected with the history of our country and the biography of our distinguished men; and, if I remember rightly, there were also some heretical works on theology, which circumstance may take off the edge of that distrust which many of our good brethren may have towards a Catholic institution. After visiting the library we went into the chapel, the aspect of which is very pleasant. It is just finished. There is a painting in fresco over the altar, and several pictures in frames at the sides, one of which, a copy from the *Night* of Correggio, I thought had some depth and power. — The weather had been heavy and dismal all day; but, as we departed, a gleam of sunshine came out on the river and the little island and valley below and the edifices beyond, which was a peaceful accompaniment to the courtesy we had received, and would have been strangely discordant with any sectarian animosities, if, at such a moment, we had been disposed to cherish any. But I was not so disposed, and I can answer for my friend.

By the kindness of Mr. Mulledy we had a note to Sister Stanislaus, whom I suppose we may call the Lady Abbess, of the Convent of the Visitation, which is at a short distance from the college. Sister Stanislaus showed us all the interior of the nunnery, from the dormitories to the refectory and the kitchen. There was an exquisite neatness about all the apartments, though there were no pretensions to elegance, which affected us very pleasantly; and certainly there was no need of the apology she made, that things were not in such good order as usual, as the Christmas holidays had commenced and many of the pupils were preparing to go home. We went from the refectory into the *Odeon* (from a Greek word signifying a song), a beautiful little room. Two young ladies, whom we found there, sang to us, accompanied by the harp, the Hymn to the Virgin, from *The Forest Sanctuary*, and some other pieces. — "This," said Sister Stanislaus, as she opened the door of a little oratory, "is an image of the blessed Virgin, whom I hope you do not suppose we worship, as many do." She looked upon that image, she told us, as she would upon the miniature of a dear friend, and she thought we could not refuse to admit that the mother of our Saviour was entitled to that degree of reverence. She went on to tell us that she was once a Protestant, (she is a daughter of Com. Jones); that the forms of the Catholic worship, as aids to devotion, had always much affected her before she took the veil, and that their impressions had continually deepened. From what she told us we inferred that she, at least, was

very far from being an idolater, and that she regarded the ceremonies, emblems, and images of her worship only as helps to devotion. She is said to be a very accomplished woman; and there is a sweetness and gentleness in her tone and manner which cannot be mistaken. The pupils love her much. We may think, perhaps, that she ought to move in a different sphere, yet none but a bigot will deny that she is doing good where she is; and as she cannot be a solitary example, it may be well for the ignorant to inquire whether Catholicism presents no other aspect than one which is full of dark and foul spots. I am no apologist for the Catholics. No denomination is so widely separated from them as ours. But our charity will not injure us. — Connected with the nunnery is a school for young ladies, in which seven of the sisters are instructresses. The greater part of the pupils are Protestants. The instances of conversion, I believe, have been solitary. The character of the school is very high.

This morning I went into a hall in South street to hear Mr. Campbell, the western Baptist, who, you know, has given his name to a sect. He has delivered several lectures in this city, on the nature and design of Christianity. His head is strongly marked, and he has a fine eye. In his manner there was nothing remarkable. It had not so much vigour and energy as I expected to see, though it was not very deficient in these respects. In reading his selections from the Scriptures, I observed that he sometimes rendered words differently from the Common Version, and frequently threw in explanatory phrases. From his manner of doing it, I thought it must be his usual practice. He is evidently an acute, strong-minded man. There were no outbursts of eloquence, and, except now and then a strong metaphor, no imagery. But everything was forcibly put, and, generally, concisely stated. His subject was *Faith*, which he illustrated from that noble passage in Hebrews which sets before us so many examples of its power. On this subject he is said to be great. Among other things he said were these: — "Faith is belief in human testimony. To believe on the evidence of testimony is an element in our nature. It is the source of ninety-nine one hundredths of all the available knowledge we have. — No man can object to the doctrine of a future life because it rests on testimony. The very existence of the *present* life depends on it; were it not for this, the child would eat poison. — Faith does not come by experience and education. You can not *teach* a child

faith. It is just as natural to believe as it is to breathe. We *can* teach *disbelief*. We do teach unbelief to our children, every day of our lives. Let a child grow up to manhood without ever having heard a falsehood, and he would then be astonished at one, it would be infinitely strange to him.—There are three sources of knowledge: the senses; reasoning, which makes opinion; and testimony, from which faith flows. (He left out mathematical truth, certainty.)—There are not different degrees of faith. You cannot believe anything until you are *assured* of its truth. But you cannot be more nor less *assured* of the truth of anything. There may be different degrees of probability that it *may be* true, but you cannot believe that it *is* true till you are *assured* of its truth. Nor are there different manners of faith, different ways of believing. The difference we observe in this respect does not result from any different exercise of faith, but from the different objects on which it is exercised. So it is with the emotions and feelings which flow from the use of the other faculties of our nature, the difference is in the objects themselves.—Faith has an amazing power. What are we required to believe? That God is, and that he is a rewarder of those who diligently seek him. Men do not believe this. They have no strength of conviction.—You cannot pray for faith, as many do, as a *prelude* to the exercise of faith. The prayer would presuppose faith, and faith depends on testimony.—The New Testament contains no naked system of theology. You find no abstract definitions there. Truth is exhibited full of life, clothed in all her habiliments.—Society is sleeping on the verge of an earthquake. The infidelity and atheism abroad and the sectarianism among Christians indicate that there will be a tremendous revolution soon."

I have given you a few of his thoughts and sayings, not, however, in his method. The lecture was extemporary, and had too many interludes and digressions. After he had left the main subject he commenced a long exhortation, the burden of which was, that there could be no possible reason why every individual who heard him should not immediately submit himself to the authority of Christ; and then he told us that if there was a person there who had never done this, an opportunity would now be given him, and immediately read a hymn. Before the last word had issued from his mouth, a pair of stentorian lungs set up the loudest and hardest notes I ever heard, and the contagion ran through the auditory. The hymn passed on, but without any effect. No one came for-

ward. Then he gave us another exhortation. But he made nothing of this. He was evidently out of the element in which his mind should act. Finally, he concluded by saying, "We will defer this matter till the evening."—The auditory was small, and, judging from its appearance, could not have understood half he said. He used *recherché* words, and talked about *the schools*, and *scholastic theology*, and *the Arminians*, and *Beza's expositions*, etc.

But I must stop here. I have put down a few things that I have seen and heard; I hope they will not be unacceptable to you.

Yours sincerely,

J. Q. Day.

Supposed Evangelical Views in England.

The Christian Observer for June, 1833, contains an article "On Works done before Justification," which may be regarded as expressing the views of that party in the Church of England who assume the name of Evangelical Christians. The article relates to a reform proposed by Mr. Wesley and by him established among the Methodists, of whom he was the leader. The writer says:—

"After Mr. Wesley had preached for more than thirty years, he found, as he tells us, the direful heresy of Antinomianism springing up among his people; with a laudable view to eradicate which, several resolutions were passed in Conference, and among them the following:—

"'We have received as a maxim, *that a man is to do nothing in order to justification.* Nothing can be more false. Whoever desires to find favour with God should cease from evil and learn to do well;—so God himself teacheth by the prophet Isaiah. Whoever repents should do works meet for repentance; and if this is not in order to find favour, what does he do them for?'"

The writer of the article makes the following observations:—

"I need not, I trust, pause to show the unscriptural character and dangerous tendency of the statement, that men are to do works meet for repentance 'in order to justification' and 'to find favour with God.' Such a statement is inconsistent with that fundamental doctrine of religion, the free justification of man-

kind by virtue of the Saviour's obedience unto death, without any human works or deservings.... The statement above transcribed asserts that 'nothing can be more false' than to say that 'man is to do nothing in order to justification,' yet this is the doctrine of all orthodox Protestant Confessions, grounded on the declarations of Scripture and strongly expressed in the Articles of the Church of England."

It may be true that all the "Confessions" which this writer would call "Orthodox" and "Protestant" are in favour of his opinion, and the authors of those confessions may have supposed their opinion to be "grounded on declarations of Scripture;" still it may be true that their opinion was incorrect, and as false as it was believed to be by Mr. Wesley. I believe the doctrine to be untrue, that it tends to Antinomianism, and that it has done much to bewilder the minds of Christians. I am not acquainted with a single "declaration of Scripture" which seems to me even to favour the doctrine; but much to the contrary.

Justification is supposed to imply the pardon of sin, as well as the approbation of God. What saith the Scripture? "Repent ye, therefore, and be converted, *that your sins may be blotted out.*" In a multitude of instances particular duties are enjoined, and encouraged by promises of Divine favour; such as the following: "Ask, and it shall be given unto you. Seek, and ye shall find." "Forgive, and ye shall be forgiven." It is also said, "He that humbleth himself shall be exalted." "To do good and to communicate, forget not; for with such sacrifices God is well pleased." "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that *doeth* the will of my Father which is in heaven." "But if the wicked turn from his wickedness, and do that which is lawful and right, *he shall live thereby.*" —*Acts* iii. 19. *Matt.* vii. 7. *Luke* vi. 37; xviii. 14. *Heb.* xiii. 16. *Matt.* vii. 21. *Ezek.* xxxiii. 19.

That believers are not to be justified and rewarded according to what Christ has done and suffered is manifest from a multitude of texts of the following import: "Blessed are they who *do* his commandments that they may have a right to the tree of life." "For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that everyone may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." It is at the final reckoning that men are to be justified or condemned, and the decision is to be according to every man's works, and not according to the works

of Christ. If it shall be found that such has been our faith in him and our love to his precepts that we have forsaken the ways of sin, obeyed his commands, and thus proved ourselves to be his disciples indeed, our faith will be counted to us for righteousness; and on this ground we shall be justified or approved. But whatever may have been our doctrinal opinions, if it shall be found that they did not work by love and purify our hearts, that, notwithstanding our professed faith in Christ, we lived and died in sin, we shall be weighed and found wanting. *Rev.* xxii. 14. 2 *Cor.* v. 10.

How perplexing must it have been to many humble Christians to be taught that "a man has nothing to do in order to justification," when the Bible so constantly teaches that every man shall be rewarded according to his own works!

The writer in the Christian Observer says:—

"Good works, it is well remarked in one of our excellent Homilies, are 'good *declarations* and *testimonies* of our justification': but to make them its precursors, and to perform them, not as the offspring of faith and prompted by love, but 'in order to find favour,' is to put them most delusively out of their right place in the system of human salvation."

I grant that good works should be the "offspring of faith and prompted by love," and I am not acquainted with any good works which are not of this character. The writer, however, seems to be of the opinion that it is wicked and dangerous to hope that we shall be justified or approved of God on account of our obedience to the precepts of his gospel, but that it is right to rely on this obedience as evidence that we are in a justified state. But may we not hope that God will justify and approve such obedience as he has required, and such obedience as he has promised to accept and count to us for righteousness? Besides, what safety could there be in relying on gospel-obedience as evidence of a justified state, were it not that God has assured us that such obedience is pleasing in his sight, and that those who perform it shall be pardoned, accepted, and rewarded?

But let it be understood that I do not speak of faith, repentance, or good works, as anything which *deserves* the pardon of sin and the salvation of the soul, but as the conditions on which our merciful God has graciously promised these favours. The proper and primary ground of reliance is the love, the mercy, and the faithfulness of God, who has revealed

to us by his Son that he will forgive the penitent, exalt him who humbles himself, and save those who "do his commandments, that they may have a right to the tree of life." It is wholly of free mercy that he has revealed to us that he will save the sinner who turns from the evil of his ways and does that which is lawful and right. — The supposed danger of hoping to be justified and saved on such conditions or grounds may be the subject of a distinct article.

NOAH WORCESTER.

The closing Paragraph of the Fifteenth Chapter of Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.

A friend has requested us to notice the closing paragraph of the fifteenth chapter of "*The Decline and Fall,*" in which Gibbon alludes to the extraordinary darkness which was observed at the crucifixion of our Saviour, and insinuates his doubts of the truth of the account given us by the evangelists, because so remarkable an occurrence is not mentioned by the philosophers Pliny and Seneca, who lived in that age, and because, moreover, it did not excite "the wonder, the curiosity, and the devotion of mankind." He thinks that it is exerting, to some extent, an injurious influence on young minds, and believes that it has never been formally answered. Our friend had probably forgotten the conclusive answer which Bishop Watson has given to the objection, in his "*Apology for Christianity.*" * But as the whole force of Gibbon's argument lies in his misrepresentations, and his manner of stating it is so insidious, we have concluded to examine his assertions more in detail than Bishop Watson has done. We quote the whole of the passage to which we have referred: —

"Under the reign of Tiberius, the whole earth, or at least a celebrated province of the Roman empire, was involved in a preternatural darkness of three hours. Even this miraculous event, which ought to have excited the wonder, the curiosity, and the devotion of mankind, passed without notice in an age of science and history. It happened during the life-time of

* An Apology for Christianity, in a series of Letters to Edward Gibbon, Esq. By R. Watson, D. D., F. R. S.

Seneca and the elder Pliny, who must have experienced the immediate effects or received the earliest intelligence of the prodigy. Each of these philosophers, in a laborious work, has recorded all the great phenomena of nature, earthquakes, meteors, comets, and eclipses, which his indefatigable curiosity could collect. Both the one and the other have omitted to mention the greatest phenomenon to which the mortal eye has been witness since the creation of the globe. A distinct chapter of Pliny is designed for eclipses of an extraordinary nature and unusual duration; but he contents himself with describing the singular defect of light which followed the murder of Cæsar, when, during the greatest part of the year, the orb of the sun appeared pale and without splendour. This season of obscurity, which cannot, surely, be compared with the preternatural darkness of the Passion, had been already celebrated by most of the poets and historians of that memorable age."

We have no sympathy with those who pass lightly over the faults of Gibbon. If he was a skeptic, it is not the dictate of charity, on that account alone, to denounce him. Had he openly expressed his doubts, a generous mind would applaud his candour. His sneers and sarcasms may be overlooked. But we cannot so readily pardon his unfairness, the impudence with which he presumes on the stupidity of his readers, nor the meanness which could stoop to petty tricks of language to infuse into the minds of others the doubts which he wanted either the honesty or the courage to avow. The passage we have quoted is one of those insidious paragraphs for which he is noted. The aspect of candour which it wears draws away the attention from its disingenuous and unfounded assertions. We shall examine it in detail, premising that we must beg the indulgence of our readers for devoting so much space to an investigation which in their opinion may require so little.

1. Gibbon tells us that both Pliny and Seneca have recorded all the great phenomena of nature which their indefatigable curiosity could collect. He might have known that such a record was not the object of either the one or the other. Pliny tells us, in his epistle to Vespasian, that "he had undertaken to consider all those subjects which the Greeks include in *the circle of the sciences*," * or, in other words, to make a *Cyclopædia*. He treats of *all* subjects, from kitchen-herbs to the revolution of the planets. Of course,

* Plin. Hist. Nat. Lib. I. Ad Vesp. Præf.

he adduces facts to illustrate those subjects, or to confirm his positions. But in some cases he mentions only one or two phenomena, in others none at all. Yet Gibbon would have us to infer that he has *recorded* all the prodigies which he had seen or of which he had ever heard.

And how is the case with regard to Seneca? In a work* of about one hundred and fifteen pages, such as the reader has before him, he has discussed the origin and properties of water, the causes of earthquakes, the source of the Nile, the nature of comets, and other matters of like importance; frequently intermingling with his discussions of physical questions moral considerations. The phenomena to which he alludes are comparatively few, and, as the most superficial reader must perceive, are introduced either incidentally or to illustrate the case in hand. In one book he does not mention any remarkable phenomenon, and in several other books alludes only to four or five. Yet Gibbon would have us believe that in such a work are recorded "all the great phenomena of nature" which "*the indefatigable curiosity*" of its author could collect.

But aside from all this, Gibbon must have known, if he examined the books to which he refers, that his assertion was untrue. Pliny has alluded to phenomena — for instance, to certain earthquakes at Rome † — of which Seneca must have been aware, but to which he has not referred. On the other hand, Pliny has omitted facts which Seneca has recorded. The latter has given us an account ‡ of the earthquake at Campania, which, in the year 63 or 64, destroyed a large part of Pompeii — about sixteen years before that celebrated city was overwhelmned by an eruption of Vesuvius, — considerably injured Herculaneum, and was seriously felt at Naples. The same fact is mentioned by Tacitus; § and the late researches at Pompeii have discovered many traces of the catastrophe. Now Pliny has several times alluded to Campania, and mentioned both Herculaneum and Pompeii, ‖ but has altogether omitted to give us an account of this remarkable occurrence, which happened only about twelve years before he published his work on Natural History, at a distance of little more than a hundred miles from Rome, and, as we may infer from Seneca,

---

* Naturales Quæstiones, — *Questions in Physics.*
† Nat. Hist. Lib. II. 84.
‡ Natural. Quæst. Lib. VI. 1.
§ Annal. XV. 22.
‖ Nat. Hist. Lib. III. 5.

produced great excitement.—But this is enough, we think, to expose the dishonesty of Gibbon's assertion that each of these writers has recorded "all the remarkable phenomena of nature which his indefatigable curiosity could collect."

2. But again, to make his case still stronger, he says that "a distinct chapter of Pliny is designed for eclipses of an extraordinary nature and unusual duration; but he contents himself with describing the singular defect of light which followed the murder of Cæsar." The unwary reader of Gibbon may be a little surprised, perhaps, to learn that this *distinct*, remarkable chapter of Pliny may be contained in less than two lines. For his satisfaction we give it below.* The whole sentence is insidious. Both "eclipses" and "contents himself" are equivocal. But we cannot consume our pages with a lengthened comment. We can only remark, using Gibbon's phrase in our own way, that if Pliny "*contented himself*" with recording only one phenomenon, we can see no very pertinent reason why he might not have had others in reserve.

3. Another assertion which requires a passing notice is, that the age of Pliny and Seneca was "an age of science and history." This is one of those broad, equivocal statements which require so much qualification that it might be questioned whether they contain any truth. Compared with preceding times, it *was* an age of science; but Gibbon probably knew, as well as any of his readers, that, compared with recent days, it had but small claims to that eminent title. He might have known that it was a credulous age, and that the most prodigious phenomena were received with but little question, not only by the mass of mankind, but by men of science; and that the latter made but little use, in a scientific point of view, of the facts which came under their observation.† He might have remembered what Pliny has said, in his dedication to

* Fiunt prodigiosi et longiores solis defectus: qualis occiso Dictatore Cæsare, et Antoniano bello, totius pæne anni pallore continuo.—*Nat. Hist.* II. 30.

† It is only in an age when the true value of physical facts in reference to the sciences is in some good degree appreciated, that extraordinary phenomena excite more than a passing alarm. We have accounts of recent phenomena of a remarkable character occurring in Asia, which would have passed unrecorded had it not been for the zeal of scientific men from Europe; among others, of a violent and destructive earthquake which happened at Cutch, in the Delta of the Indus, in 1819; in allusion to which it is stated by Lieut. Burnes, who examined the site in 1826–29, that "these wonderful phenomena passed unheeded by the inhabitants of Cutch."—Lyell's *Geology*, Vol. I. ch. xxiii. pp. 465–468

Vespasian, by way of apology for his work, "that the path which he had chosen was little known to authors, nor was it one which the mind was eager to pursue; that no Roman had attempted to treat of those subjects, and no Grecian had gone over them all." * He might have remembered that the progress which had been made in physical science was small; and although philosophers had laboured in some of its departments with great assiduity, yet that their knowledge was scanty.† There was little or none of that spirit of scientific research which is so intense and active in our own age; and there were few of those facilities for collecting facts, which are now compelling the heavens and the earth to give up their hidden knowledge. There were only the ill-directed beginnings of those labours which are building up that gigantic and magnificent edifice, which, already towering, to the heavens, strikes the beholder with admiration and awe.

4. We can notice only one other instance of Gibbon's disingenuousness and unfounded assertion. He says, at the commencement of the paragraph we have quoted, that "the *whole earth*, or at least a celebrated province of the Roman empire, was involved in a preternatural darkness of three hours;" and adds, in a note, that "Origen and a few modern critics are desirous of confining it to the land of Judea." But he seems to have suddenly forgotten even this doubtful and insidious admission, and proceeds on the assumption that the darkness covered the whole world, that Pliny and Seneca must have felt the immediate effects of it, and that it was "the greatest phenomenon to which the mortal eye has been witness since the creation of the globe." It would have been well, if, instead of putting the *commentators* in battle-array against each other, he had himself decided whether it is *neces-*

* Nat. Hist. I. Ad Vesp. Præf.

† At this period comparatively many facts had been collected; but it was by *gradual accumulation* in books. Pliny refers us to two thousand volumes, from which he had principally obtained his knowledge of physics. There were few or none to arrange these facts, or who thought it worth their while to draw inferences from them. Of Pliny himself, the most distinguished Roman writer on Natural Science of the age to which Gibbon refers, whose works have come down to us, the learned author of a recent work on geology remarks, that "in this department [the changes on the earth's surface] as in others, he has restricted himself to the task of a compiler, without reasoning on the facts stated by him or attempting to digest them into regular order." — *Lyell's Geology*, Vol. I. c. ii. p. 22. His work is a monument of learning for the age in which it was written, but as anyone may observe who will take the trouble to examine it, it abounds in extravagancies. See Enfield's *Hist. Philos.* Vol. II. ch. ii. 8.

sary to infer from the evangelical account, that "the whole earth" was involved in obscurity. But this would probably have deprived his shaft of half its force. Nor is this disingenuousness the worst of the case. In one of his notes he says, that "the Fathers would seem to cover the whole earth with darkness, and that they are followed in this by *most of the moderns.*" In another note, to which we have just referred, he tells his readers that "Origen and *a few modern critics* are *desirous* of confining it to the land of Judea." We know not where Gibbon obtained his authority for such statements. They seem to us to have been dictated by gross ignorance, or by something which would assuredly fasten upon a person of less reputation the charge of dishonesty. The very reverse of what he has stated is the fact. *Nearly all* the modern commentators of extended reputation are not indeed *desirous* to confine the occurrence of the phenomenon to the land of Judea, but it is their *opinion* that it did *not* probably extend beyond those limits. After a close examination of the best authorities within our reach,* we have not been able to find *one*, out of the great host of modern commentators, who is inclined to believe that the darkness covered the "whole earth," and no more than eight or ten who extend it beyond Judea; † and most of the latter are but little known.

Were we not afraid of wearying the patience of our readers, we might make additional comments on the passage to which our attention has been called. We doubt whether another paragraph can be found, even in "The Decline and Fall," so imposing and at the same time so disingenuous. We have said enough, we think, to show with what scrutiny one should peruse the writings of Gibbon, and with how great distrust his assertions should be received. If the passage we have examined would not convict him of dishonesty before a too sensitive charity, at least its ingenuity will not conceal the vulgar stratagems of an ignoble mind.

But still the question returns, why it was that the darkness at the crucifixion was not recorded by Pliny and Seneca. This question can be satisfactorily answered after two explanatory remarks.

---

* Wolf. Curæ Phil. et Crit. — Poole's Synopsis. — Biblia Critica. — Koecher, in his "Analecta," expresses himself so loosely that we have received no satisfaction from him on this point.

† Grotius thinks that it must be referred to the Roman empire, or at least to the larger part of it.

The account given of the event by St. Matthew, is this: "Now from the sixth hour there was darkness over all the land until the ninth hour." *Matt.* xxvii. 45. It is well known that the word γῆ (*gē*), here translated *land*, like the kindred words in other languages, is used in the New Testament in a broader or narrower sense according to its connexion. Sometimes it signifies the land as distinguished from the water; sometimes, the whole habitable earth; sometimes, a province or particular territory; and sometimes, only a town or city. We have frequent examples of its use in the two latter senses. For instance, "Then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn" * — i. e. all the tribes of *the land of Israel*, the reference being to the destruction of Jerusalem; "Bethlehem, *the land* of Judah;" † "*the land* of Zebulon, and *the land* of Naphthalim;" ‡ "*The land* of Sodom." § Now there is nothing in the whole account which the evangelists have given, that obliges us to believe that the darkness extended beyond the land of Judea, or even beyond the vicinity of Jerusalem, and the phrase "*all the land*," as we perceive by the examples given above, may have this limitation. Moreover, it seems to us to be the very expression which one would naturally use, in speaking of the immediate territory in which the phenomenon occurred. We assume, therefore, what there is nothing in the evangelical account to contradict, that the darkness covered only Jerusalem and its vicinity, or, at most, the land of Judea.

Again, the darkness probably was not *intense*. In the common acceptation of the word, darkness admits of degrees. The darkness of the crucifixion, then, may have been slight, for anything that appears to the contrary, and the general tenor of the narrative would give the impression to our minds that it was so. Besides, it can be shown, as we think and shall attempt to prove in a future number, that it was the natural attendant of the earthquake. But if this was the case, we may conclude it could not have been more intense than similar phenomena which have attended other earthquakes; and that such actually was its character there is in our own minds but little doubt.

Now, in the first place, there is no *antecedent* probability that a phenomenon of such a character, and so limited in its

---

* Matt. xxiv. 30. † Matt. ii. 6.
‡ Matt. iv. 15. § Matt. xi. 24.

extent, should have been mentioned by any Roman historian or philosopher. They might or they might not have recorded it. At the best, there is only an even chance that they would have alluded to it, even on the supposition that they had known it.

2. As the age in which the phenomenon occurred was exceedingly credulous, and, as we have before said, the greatest prodigies were received without much question, even by scientific men, and as little or no use was made of physical facts in a scientific point of view, we may infer that the historian would record only those occurrences which *to him* seemed the most remarkable, or which, owing to some peculiar circumstances, were especially interesting to himself or his readers. It is antecedently *improbable*, therefore, that a Roman writer would have mentioned an obscuration of the sun which lasted only three hours, which happened in one of the most remote and despised provinces of the empire, nearly two thousand miles from Rome, and which in that age and to an ordinary observer could not have seemed very remarkable. "Why," asks Bp. Watson, "should all the world take notice of a darkness which extended itself for a few miles about Jerusalem, and lasted but three hours? * The Italians, especially, had no reason to remark the event as singular; since they were accustomed at that time, as they are at present, to see the neighbouring regions so darkened, for days together, by the eruptions of Ætna and Vesuvius, that no man could know his neighbour."

3. In the age to which we have referred, there was no spirit of scientific research. There were no collectors of facts. Scientific knowledge had gradually, and in a certain sense accidentally, become accumulated in books. Pliny gives us to understand that he had drawn nearly all his facts from writers who had gone before him. Now it is altogether probable, at least there is nothing to the contrary, that the only record of the darkness at the crucifixion was to be found in the evangelical accounts. But the sect of the Christians was obscure and despised. It is not even mentioned by Pliny † or Seneca.

---

* The memorable darkness which occurred in New England, May 19, 1780, was so great in most parts of the country "that people were unable to read common print, determine the time of day by their clocks or watches, dine, or manage their domestic business, without the light of candles." —*Mem. Amer. Acad.* Vol. I. pp. 234-5. Yet how little interest did this excite out of New England!

† Bishop Watson, indeed, says, "There is a passage in the Natural

What books of the New Testament had as yet been written were still less known. It is not at all probable, therefore, that Pliny and Seneca should have resorted to them. Besides, they were the *religious* books of a sect, and for this reason, also, it is highly improbable that they would have searched such writings for scientific facts. Indeed, we have almost conclusive evidence that Pliny did not. He might have found in the sacred books of the Christians, especially in the Old Testament, an abundance of the most remarkable facts, which to a pagan would have appeared no more incredible than many which he has mentioned. But among the numerous references he has given to the works which he consulted, we do not find the Jewish writings or the evangelical narratives alluded to in a single instance.

4. It was not the object of either Pliny or Seneca to record all the facts within his knowledge. Seneca, especially, had a very different design. It cannot be *very* wonderful, therefore, that they should have omitted to mention the occurrence we have been considering. But what makes the case still stronger, and, in our opinion, settles the question, is, that both the one and the other have failed to record important phenomena which happened in their own land, and which were of such a character that they could not have failed to record them had it been their object to mention all the natural phenomena of which they knew. If they omitted these, no reasoning will convince us that they should necessarily have recorded the other. It is more illogical, therefore, to doubt the veracity of Luke or Matthew because two Roman writers have not alluded to the darkness at the crucifixion, than it is to question the authority of Seneca because Pliny has given us no account of the earthquake at Pompeii.

We here close the argument. We have presented sufficient considerations, we think, to satisfy a candid mind that there is little force in the objection to which our attention has been called. It never would have been so prominent, had it not been for the imposing aspect in which Gibbon has clothed

History of Pliny, which, how much soever it may have been overlooked, contains, I think, a very strong allusion to the Christians; and clearly intimates he had heard of their miracles. In speaking concerning the origin of magic, he says, 'There is also another faction of magic, derived from the Jews, Moses and Lotopea, and subsisting at present.' " See also the Bishop's note on this. But it is well known that the Jews themselves practised magic in that age, and Pliny probably alluded to that fact; regarding the later practice of magic as the same with the Old-Testament miracles.

it. Its strength vanishes when his misrepresentations are exposed. But if this were not the fact, and even if the objection were formidable in itself, still it could only be regarded as *a difficulty*, which it might not be easy to clear up, but it could never impeach the authority of three independent, honest witnesses, unless it were *demonstrated* that Pliny and Seneca must have known and *must* have recorded the darkness of the Passion had it really occurred.

In some future number we shall endeavour to explain the phenomenon and some of the attendant circumstances.

J. Q. Day.

Letters to Unbelievers.

No. II.

UNREASONABLE MODES OF ATTACKING CHRISTIANITY.

Fellow-Citizens,

My last letter contained an explanation of the nature, causes, occasions, and present state of infidelity. In the present communication I shall endeavour to prove, to the satisfaction of every honest mind, that most of your modes of attacking Christianity are irrational. Let the same kind of reasoning which you employ against the gospel be applied in a similar way to any opinion, system, society, or institution whatsoever, and I sincerely believe that you would unhesitatingly pronounce it sophistical and unsatisfactory. And if you will give your candid attention to my remarks and illustrations, I think you will admit my conclusions and acknowledge to your own souls that most of your opposition to religion is unreasonable.

I. *Christians of Past Ages.*

1. What has been the intellectual, moral, and religious condition of heathen nations? Have they not been degraded by ignorance, enslaved by priestcraft, tormented by supersti-

tion, debased by idolatry, polluted by crime, and made wretched by wickedness? Have they not excluded woman from her rightful share in the blessings of life? Have they not sacrificed human victims to their idols? No one acquainted with history will deny these facts.

Now suppose I should reason concerning these undisputed truths in the following manner: "You learn from these particulars the true condition of the heathen world. You see what unaided reason can do for mankind. Her natural, her best, her only fruits are ignorance, superstition, iniquity, and wretchedness. She is therefore a great curse to the human family; for these evils do not exist among the brute creation; and consequently it becomes our solemn duty to labour for her destruction."

Would you consider this correct reasoning? No. You would doubtless reply: "We admit the accuracy of your statement, but we deny the legitimacy of your conclusion. Your description, however, is partial and deceptive. For reason produces other and better results even among the uncivilized; and the evils mentioned arise principally from her want of cultivation. Let her be educated and enlightened, and she will yield a rich return of virtue and happiness. And to attempt her destruction, because in a state of ignorance she does not perform impossibilities, would be as absurd as to kill the child because he does not exhibit the powers of manhood. Your attack upon reason, on account of the conduct of the heathen, is truly unreasonable."

2. Let me now apply this illustration. What has been the condition of Christians in some former ages of the church? Many of the number were uneducated, superstitious, fanatical, bigoted. They persecuted each other for an honest difference of opinion. They waged wars for the promotion of sectarian views of religion. They submitted to the tyranny of a corrupt priesthood. They exhibited little of the spirit and few of the virtues of the gospel. These and similar facts no one will deny.

What use do you make of these facts in your attacks upon Christianity? Call to mind the contents of some of your papers, pamphlets, and books. Recollect the burden of many a conversation and lecture. The amount of what you have said may be stated thus: "You see in these particulars the only legitimate fruits of the gospel. And will you suffer a system to survive which has produced such an abundant harvest of ignorance, vice, and misery? No; down with super-

stition, down with priestcraft; down with the Bible." This is one of your favourite modes of attacking Christianity. But is it not as unreasonable to condemn religion on account of the conduct of professed believers of past ages, as to condemn reason on account of the conduct of ancient heathen nations? Yes; in my estimation the former is much more irrational than the latter. For unassisted reason has uniformly produced ignorance, superstition, idolatry, priestcraft, and wickedness. Read the history of ancient and modern heathen nations, and you will not feel disposed to controvert this assertion. When the Christian church was in its most degraded condition, the great body of professed believers were much superior to their heathen neighbours; and many of the number acquired knowledge and exhibited a virtuous character amidst the general corruption. Besides, the gospel never authorized any one of the evils mentioned; it condemned the whole, in the most unequivocal language; so that, after all, we must attribute them to reason or infidelity. Is it not, then, infinitely more unreasonable to condemn Christianity on account of the unchristian conduct of practical unbelievers, than it would be to condemn reason on account of the evils which have always existed in every heathen nation? I appeal to your honesty for an answer.

II. *Christians of the Present Period.*

1. What has been the character of unbelievers in modern times? Collect into one company all the individuals of both sexes who have professed to reject Christ and Christianity. Among the number you will discover a considerable portion of the ignorant, the degraded, the abandoned. You will notice many of the intemperate, many of the corrupters of youth, many thieves, robbers, and pirates, many of the inmates of prisons and the victims of the gallows. I state facts which no intelligent person will deny; not in order to cast reproach upon the virtuous portion of the company, but for the sake of the argument.

Suppose I should make these facts a foundation for the following conclusions: "In the lives and deaths of these debased men and women you behold the natural fruits of infidelity. Some of the number have confessed that their downward course commenced in the neglect of the means of religious improvement. No doubt others would have made similar confessions, had they disclosed the whole truth in re-

lation to their progress in iniquity. Yes; whenever you hear of a drunkard, a libertine, a shameless female, you may be sure they are unbelievers. So, too, when you read of a thief, a robber, a pirate, you may rank them with infidels. And so sure as you have anything to do with infidel principles, so sure you will be led on from one degree of iniquity to another, until you are completely ruined."

Would you call this correct reasoning? To this statement you would probably reply in terms like the following: "We acknowledge that many abandoned men and women have professed to have no belief in Christianity; but we do not admit that it was their unbelief which made them depraved. It was their depravity that induced them to renounce that religion which threatened the wicked with future punishment. They were ruined before they called themselves unbelievers; and many of them we never acknowledged as belonging to our party. They are no fair specimen of our company. We ask you to look at the virtuous, to learn the influence of our principles. As we have no expectation of another life, if we act consistently with our belief we shall surely avoid everything which can give us misery or shorten our days. And to condemn our principles, on account of the character of the abandoned portion of our party, is truly unreasonable."

2. Let me apply this illustration. Look at the Christians of our country. They are numerous; they belong to every class and condition in society; they profess every variety of creed. Among this great company you may behold every diversity of character. You see some who are superstitious, some who are fanatical, some who are bigoted, some who are dishonest, some who are intemperate, some who are licentious, and some who are guilty of other crimes. These are the facts as they exist before the world.

What use do you make of these facts. You endeavour to employ them for the destruction of Christianity. Look over your papers of the last five years. A very large proportion of their pages are filled with accounts of the unchristian conduct and dispositions of professed believers. This has been made one principal argument against the truth and value of our religion. You reason on this subject in terms somewhat like the following: "Here you see the fruits of the gospel. One man is turned out of the church for an honest difference of opinion; another is disturbing the peace of his neighbourhood by his fanaticism. One, who is a deacon, has cheated his neighbour; and a minister has probably been guilty of

murder. And will you any longer tolerate a system which destroys the peace of families and is a curse to the country?"

This, then, is another of your common modes of attacking Christianity. But is it not as unreasonable to condemn the gospel on account of the vices of professing Christians, as to condemn infidelity on account of the wickedness of professed infidels? Yes; it is much more irrational. For there is nothing in infidelity to deter anyone from wickedness. Many have confessed that it led them into vice; and that, if true, it was not useful to individuals or society. At this moment, there are in this commonwealth numerous young men who were virtuous until they embraced infidel principles; now they are very thoroughly depraved. I think one or more of such cases must occur to the minds of most of you. From much inquiry, some reading, and considerable observation, I am fully satisfied that unbelief naturally leads to vice and wretchedness. Nor is this all. The number of immoral unbelievers is very large in proportion to the whole body; while the number of professed believers who disgrace their profession is very small in comparison with the whole multitude. Besides, every sincere Christian is ready to condemn the iniquities of a professor of religion, as severely as he denounces those of an infidel, and much more so. And above all, the gospel forbids every evil which now exists in Christendom. It threatens punishment to all who disobey the divine precepts. So far, then, as anyone does wrong, so far his sin is attributable to practical infidelity, and not to his belief in Jesus. Is it not, then, infinitely more unreasonable to condemn Christianity on account of the unchristian conduct of practical infidels, than it would be to condemn infidelity on account of the vices and crimes of unbelievers? Let your conscience answer.

III. *Differences of Opinion among Christians.*

1. What is the present state of belief on religious subjects among the anti-christians of our country? If I may credit your own statements, there exists almost every possible variety. Some believe in one God and some in no God. Some believe that Jesus was a good man, others regard him as an impostor, and others, again, pretend that no such person ever lived on earth. Some believe in a future life, and others think we shall all perish like the brutes. In short, there is no kind of agreement in opinion among unbelievers, on the

subject of religion. No one acquainted with your writings will deny the truth of this statement.

Suppose I should adopt the following reasoning on this subject: "You see that infidels differ from one another on almost every religious subject. This great diversity of opinion manifests the danger of renouncing revelation. Their principal exertions seem to be aimed at the destruction of everything which can promote holiness and happiness. They take no pains to build up any code of laws for the preservation of society. It will be time enough to attend to their claims when they shall have framed a new system of morals, better adapted to human nature than any we now possess, and one which shall make themselves wiser and better and happier than their Christian neighbours. And until such a period, you will act very unwisely to read one page of their writings, or to listen to one word of their conversation or harangues. Until they agree on some fundamental principles of belief and conduct, you should consider their pretensions unworthy the least notice or attention."

Would you approve this mode of attacking infidelity? I think you would make some such reply as this: "We admit the truth of your statements. We do not pretend to be agreed among ourselves. We must first remove the great mass of error from the minds of people, before we attempt to rear the temple of truth. At present, it is our main business to prove all religions false, and pernicious in their effects upon individuals and society. We all believe according to the evidence presented, on whatever subject arises. We are free inquirers, released from all the shackles of superstition and cowardice. We ask no one to believe our opinions. We only desire the people to give up their prejudices and prepossessions. When we have produced a universal skepticism as to every existing creed, then we shall find time to prepare an unexceptionable system of morals. And to condemn our cause on account of our differences of opinion is perfectly unreasonable."

2. Let me apply this illustration. Protestant Christians profess to take the Scriptures as their standard of faith and practice. Each individual of the whole body is exhorted to search them for himself and abide by the results of his investigation. Owing to the original differences in the constitution of the minds of people, to our different education and influences and prejudices, and to the obscurity of some parts of the sacred writings, there naturally arises a considerable

diversity of belief among equally sincere and pious Christians. No believer will be disposed to deny the truth of this statement.

Now what use do you make of this fact in your attacks on Christianity? The substance of your remarks may be thus expressed: "You call upon us to embrace the gospel. We ask you to mention its essential principles. No two of you give us the same answers. What one pronounces saving truth, another denounces as ruinous error. Before you call upon us to believe, you should come to some agreement among yourselves. So long as you remain thus divided in sentiment, you cannot expect us to listen to your claims. If those who profess to be the expounders of Christianity cannot inform us in what its fundamental doctrines consist, surely this circumstance ought to condemn the system as a human fabrication. We shall accordingly endeavour to destroy its pretensions to the character of a revelation, and try to induce the young to give no attention to the subject, until you can tell us what the gospel is."

This is another of your common modes of attacking Christianity. But is it not as unreasonable to condemn religion because a difference of opinion exists among the disciples of Jesus, as to condemn infidelity on account of the want of agreement among unbelievers? Yes; to me it appears much more unreasonable. For when we ask you to believe the gospel, we do not mean any one of the various sectarian systems. We wish you to go directly to the Founder of our religion, and learn for yourselves the essentials of Christianity. We desire you to exercise the same rights which we claim for ourselves. Above all, we wish you to acquire that holiness of heart and life which furnishes an internal witness of the truth of revelation. Nor is this all. While unbelievers are agreed on no principles of faith or morals, there is among Christians all but the most entire unanimity as to everything essential to a holy life, a peaceful death, and a happy immortality. We all believe in the existence and perfections of one all-perfect Deity. We all believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of the living God, and the Saviour of the world. We all believe that the Scriptures contain the record of a divine revelation. We all believe that religion consists in loving our heavenly Father supremely, and our fellow-men as ourselves. We all believe that no one can be truly happy either here or hereafter without moral goodness. All our differences of opinion might be banished from

the world without the least injury to the cause of Christianity. Is it not, then, infinitely more unreasonable to condemn the gospel on account of the various creeds of professed believers, than it would be to condemn infidelity on account of the total want of agreement among unbelievers? Let common sense return an honest answer.

IV. *Expense of maintaining Christianity.*

1. How much does it cost our commonwealth to furnish the means of education to all its inhabitants? To answer this question satisfactorily, you must estimate the expense of school-houses, academies, colleges, and other necessary buildings. You must also ascertain the amount of salaries paid to male and female teachers of public and private schools, to preceptors of academies, and professors in higher literary institutions. To all this you must add the cost of books and apparatus, the value of the time of those pupils who are old enough to earn wages, and a variety of contingencies. When you have obtained the sum, you will learn that it costs this state several hundred thousand dollars, annually, to provide the means of education for the whole people.

Suppose a reformer should come among you from one of the states of our Union in which no public provision is made for the education of children and youth. Suppose he should go from town to town, lecturing in terms like the following: "Citizens of Massachusetts, permit me to say that your conduct in relation to the subject of education is exceedingly foolish. You annually expend for this object several hundred thousand dollars. And what do you receive for all this money? Nothing but an infinite variety of evils. You erect half a dozen buildings in every town. You support a class of men and women who are too lazy and too proud to earn their bread by the sweat of their brow. They take your children from all useful labour, and they qualify them for every species of mischief and crime. If none were taught to read or write, there would be no newspapers to keep you all the time quarrelling about politics; there would be none of those law-books to cheat you out of your property; there would be none of those books of travels to entice away your young men from their country; there would be no forgers nor counterfeiters; in short, there would be none of that infinite series of evils which now consume your time and money and destroy your peace and equality. I speak from my own experience. I know

nothing of your book-learning; and I have amassed a fortune. I have experienced no inconvenience, and enjoyed much more happiness than my reading neighbours. I think, therefore, that you act very unwisely to expend such sums of precious gold and silver for that which produces nothing but misery and ruin; and as a reformer I call upon you to close your school-houses, dismiss your teachers, destroy your printing-presses, and burn your libraries."

Would you consider this sound and conclusive reasoning? I think you would be very apt to say in reply: "Sir, we have listened attentively to your remarks. We differ from you altogether on this question. You ought to know that the various evils to which you have alluded are the abuses of education, and not the natural fruits of knowledge. You ought also to understand that money does not answer every want of human nature. We have tried the experiment, to our own satisfaction. We know, by our own experience, that the pleasures of the mind are much superior to those of the body. We also know that our information not only gives us daily comfort, but qualifies us for greater enjoyment and usefulness. Besides, you ought to see that without learning we should all relapse into a state of barbarism. And although you may have lived very well without a knowledge of letters, yet this is altogether owing to the civilized and educated state of those around you. Instead, therefore, of being a real reformer, as you seem to believe yourself to be, you are labouring to degrade us to the savage condition, to destroy all the refinements of life and all the blessings of society. Your present attempt to subvert the means of education and knowledge, on account of their abuses and the expense of their maintenance, fully proves that you do not understand even the first principles of correct reasoning."

2. Let me apply this illustration. It costs this country a large sum of money to support Christian institutions. This fact no one is disposed to deny. What use do you make of this circumstance in your attacks upon Christianity? You proclaim it to the public in every possible manner: in your conversation, in your discourses, in your publications; thus making an incessant appeal to avarice, the lowest passion of human nature. The foreign mother of American infidelity repeats the fact in almost every lecture of that volume to which you look as an oracle of wisdom. Her sentiments echo it from one end of the country to the other, in terms like the following: "Citizens of the United States, you are fine fools,

It costs you twenty millions of money every year for the support of your religion! Yes; twenty millions are worse than wasted, in building churches, and supporting a class of lazy, quarrelsome ministers, who divide your families, consume your time, distract your brains, and eat up your substance. We have done without any of your superstition, and we have experienced no disadvantage from our unbelief and irreligion. We therefore call upon you to turn your temples into halls of science, to set your clergy to work, to spend your Sabbaths in searching into the qualities of matter, and, above all, to save your precious money." This, likewise, is a most favourite mode of attacking Christianity.

But is it not as unreasonable to condemn Christianity, on account of its abuses and its expenses, as it would be to destroy education, for the same reasons? Yes; the former is much more irrational than the latter. For what purpose were we created? For happiness. What can confer this invaluable blessing? Money? No. Look into the world. Is not gold oftener a curse than a comfort? And what solace can it render in sickness? What support in trial? What consolation in affliction? What peace to remorse? What joy in death? What preparation for eternity? Can education make men good? It may qualify them for greater evil as well as for greater virtue. Of itself it is insufficient for the wants of man. Religion, and religion alone, can enable him to answer the design of his creation. We have tried the experiment for ourselves. We have lived without the influence of the gospel on our hearts. We have since yielded, in some humble degree, to its guidance. We can testify, from our own experience, that it satisfies all the desires of the mind. We know that it makes us better and happier. And although you may have felt no great inconvenience from its absence from your hearts, it is only because those around you were actuated by its heavenly spirit. You believe yourselves to be reformers, but you are assuredly labouring for the overthrow of everything valuable on earth, education, morals, religion, domestic enjoyment, individual and social happiness. Is it not, then, infinitely more unreasonable to labour for the destruction of religion on account of the expense of its maintenance, than it would be to destroy the means of education for the same reason? Judge ye for yourselves.

B. Whitman.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

The Deist's Immortality, and an Essay on Man's Accountability for his Belief. By LYSANDER SPOONER. Boston, 1834. 8vo. pp. 14.

This is the title of a pamphlet sent us through the Post-office with the author's respects; but who the author is, notwithstanding he has given us his name, we have no means of even *guessing*. But since in sending it he doubtless meant us an act of civility, we receive it accordingly, and will do what we suppose he will thank us for, devote a paragraph or two to the consideration of its merits.

"*The Deist's Immortality!*" The title struck us with some surprise; not that we never heard of Deists who believed in the immortality of the soul, but because we have never, though extensively acquainted with unbelievers in Christianity, met with one who had any belief in a future state of existence, and we had therefore concluded that it was doubtful whether any such at the present day could be found. We are glad, however, to find we were wrong. We hail it as a good symptom, that even a deistical pamphleteer ventures to offer reasons for believing in another life. We hold the hope of another world to be so important, we consider it of such great price, that we are glad to find it advocated by anyone; and if by one more than another, by one who from the name he assumes may have influence where a professed Christian would have none. We say, then, to Mr. Spooner, that we will not find fault with him for "casting out devils," though he "follow not with us." When we find a Deist advocating the truth, we receive him into fellowship just so far as he advocates it, but no farther. Mr. Spooner's arguments are not new. They are arguments which we suspect he would not easily have found, had there not been such a religion as the Christian and such a class of people as the clergy. All that is valuable in *The Deist's Immortality* we had previously read in the writings of Dr. Channing and other eminent defenders of Christianity. Had the author been aware of his obligations to Christianity, we think he could hardly have spoken of it so slightingly as he has; he might, perhaps, have acknowledged the source whence he derived his belief. His notions of a future state, which he contrasts with what he calls the Bible-view, he ought to be aware are not notions peculiar to Deists; so far

design to assist our feeble conceptions of the great Example set before us for our emulation by reflecting it more vividly to our view.

From his habits of close devotedness to his people, Dr. Parker was less generally known than many others have been whose powers of mind and moral worth are hardly to be named in comparison; but for the sake of the church, for the sake of our race, we do most earnestly trust that an example so rich in the most exalted Christian virtues will not be suffered to be embalmed only in the affections of the flock of his charge. It was the distinguished privilege of the writer of the Address before us to be his intimate and confidential friend, and we are glad to see that he is disposed to give to the public somewhat of the fruit of his intimacy; we wish it were more, for we are sure, from this specimen, that the office of Dr. Parker's biographer could hardly fall into more competent hands.

We quote those passages which relate particularly to the character of the revered subject of this Address.

"Were I to point out any one trait which I thought most distinguishing in our beloved pastor's character as a Christian, I should name Faith. By this I mean an unwavering belief and trust which led him to view all things as under the superintending providence of God; a perfect conviction, evinced by his whole mode of thinking and speaking, that this providence was directed by infinite wisdom and infinite love, and supported by infinite power; that the greatest and the least events were taking place under His control; and that these events would all be overruled for good. Whenever the perversity of men, or their ignorance, brought trouble or calamity upon individuals or a community, — while he deeply lamented the evil, and mourned over the sufferings which would occur in the process, he never for a moment doubted that the good purposes of God would be accomplished, and that the happiness of the virtuous, however disturbed for the present, would be ultimately promoted. By this faith, this confidence, he could always perceive 'the bright radiance of the clear sky beyond the gatherings of the darkest tempest;' and the minor troubles of life, those trials of every day's existence, which, far more frequently than great temptations, overthrow the balance of the Christian character, he could put aside with his hand, as unworthy to move him.

"To acquire this faith, my children, no great powers of mind, no uncommon acquirements are absolutely necessary. Such powers and acquirements, rightly directed, will serve to enlighten and confirm the Christian faith; but I have heard our deceased friend often say that the most beautiful ornament of the highly cultivated intellect was to have that child-like trust in God, which, while the noblest energies of the mind are engaged in investigating the wonders of divine love, can repose in humble simplicity on the care and love of a heavenly Father."

"Again, this faith and trust in God, in which our beloved pastor found such peace and such constant support, was ever accompanied by obedience. He knew that it was folly, and worse than folly, to say that we trust in God to make all things work together for good,

while by neglect of or disobedience to God's commands we do all we can to counteract his holy will. If he trusted in God to make him happy, he knew that he must do all that God required of him. Thus every part of his conduct was regulated by fixed principles. His first and his last inquiry, under all circumstances, was, What is duty? What is right? — Never, What is expedient? What will be thought of this or that course? These latter questions he never asked, except when their consideration was involved in deciding upon duty. The question of duty once settled, his course was settled; and being conscious of having faithfully used the best lights which he could obtain to discover his duty, let events occur as they would, he suffered no vain regrets to harass his mind. He did what he thought was for the best, and then left the result with God."

"To have at all times a distinct and fixed purpose — never to act from mere impulse, or to leave himself to the dictate of momentary feeling — was always the endeavour of him whom we mourn. The day before he died, some one said to him, 'You have always tried to make those around you happy; you would never give anyone pain.' 'So far as I have had *distinct purposes* it may have been so,' he replied."

"There was nothing more strongly marked in our beloved teacher than his openness, and firm, independent honesty of character, his utter abhorrence of falsehood and duplicity. Who has not seen his clear eye flash, and his countenance curl with scorn and detestation, when pointing out the shiftings of hypocrisy, or unveiling the hollow-hearted pretender? If ever there seemed a failure in the charity of his heart, it was when he saw an attempt to deceive, or a course pursued for mere exhibition or effect. Falsehood in any shape, he could not, he would not, endure. He would never veil it by a soft name. A lie he would call a lie, and as such he would treat it, in all its forms and disguises; and if anything human would make the heart of the deceiver quail, it was such a look as I have sometimes seen dart from his usually mild and benevolent face."

"To tell you that our pastor made it the business of his life to do good, that this was the great purpose for which he spoke and acted and laboured, would be only to say that he was a faithful minister and a true follower of his Master and yours. Are there not many of you who remember now, as you look back upon your occasional intercourse with him, how almost everything which you heard him speak had some good meaning in it, something which you could think of afterwards with profit? When he has accidentally met you, and with easy yet dignified familiarity has asked you about your schools, your studies, and your amusements, was there not always some little hint, some good-natured remark, which would convey, almost without your knowing it, a good thought into your mind? which, without the formality of advice, would make you think more of your duty, of the goodness of God, of the blessings which you enjoy? Young as you are, you could hardly help noticing this peculiar and happy faculty in your minister; and we, who knew him longer and better, can remember that it was his way with all; and yet no one ever had less than he the character of the prosing monitor, whose approach we rather avoid than invite. He had a purpose of usefulness in everything. Ever upon the watch, he acquired a most unusual quickness and tact in seizing the right moment and the right way of effecting his purpose."

"I should delight to go on thus, talking to you of our pastor's character. In all its parts the contemplation of it must be profitable and edifying to young and old. I should delight to say more to you of that humble and unreserved trust in God which sustained him under sufferings such as few have experienced, of his submissive acquiescence in the whole will of his heavenly Father, and of the cheerful fortitude which never left him even in the hour of death. In the early stages of the disease which first attacked him, when expressing my anxiety at his acute bodily sufferings, he would speak of *them* almost with contempt; but when he thought of the peculiar nature of the disease in its influences upon the mental energies, of its power to benumb and retard those exercises of the mind in which his joy and his usefulness consisted, then it was that his fortitude was called to its severest test. 'Bodily pain,' he would say, 'is nothing; it is not worthy of a thought, if there be but a free use of the powers of the mind; while these are left untouched, we can bear all which God sends us; and still, if these are affected, we shall not be forsaken.' When travelling with him in a more recent stage of his illness, he once spoke freely upon the prospect before him. 'I think,' said he, 'that a few months, at most, must settle all questions. I have no fear of the result. I dread not death, — but to look forward to years of uselessness — to being a burthen instead of being a helper to others — this, I will confess, is terrible to me. But I have no fears that God will forsake me.' Since his entire confinement to his chamber he has more than once repeated this to me, 'I have never felt myself forsaken for a moment, and I have no fear but that I shall be supported to the end.'

"It is but a few short weeks since I had a brief but most cheerful conversation with him upon his prospects after his change was passed. He spoke of his 'friends in heaven' as familiarly as of those in another city, and told me I should smile if I knew whom he most often thought of meeting. I told him I supposed he thought of many who would there be his familiar companions, whom I could only hope to see as they passed by far above me. 'Some,' said he, 'will have gotten far ahead of us all, but we shall be within the influence of and receive happiness from the highest of all.' A few nights before his death I said to him, 'Your cup of affliction seems deeply drugged; and as God chasteneth whom he loveth, may you not feel that you have great proof of his love; or, at least, that he sees that your faith will bear great trials?' 'We should be careful not to look upon any temporal circumstances,' he replied, 'as in themselves marks of God's anger or approbation. We may look upon the temper with which we meet these circumstances as evidences of our Christian state.' I told him it had been said that perhaps he was suffering for our benefit, that we might see the power of Christian principles set forth in him, and that thus he was adding to the amount of good which he had already done in the world. His tone in reply seemed to reprove me for even this slight allusion to his virtues and his usefulness — for no man ever shrank from praise as he did. 'Whatever good I have done,' said he, 'let God have the praise.' I added, 'You will let him have your gratitude also, that he has made you the instrument of so much good.' 'I wish not,' he said, 'to depreciate the good that I may have done, or to pretend ignorance of it. But of my own deficiencies I am more sensible than any other person can be. And this I know, that if I attain heaven, it will not be because

I have earned it. Eternal life is the gift of God, and,' added he after a pause, 'it will be given to those who have formed and cherished a taste for its joys. That I may have acquired some relish for its felicities affords me consolation and hope.' On parting with him I expressed the hope that he might have a quiet night. 'I shall have such a night as God sends,' was his calm reply.

"Such were the occasional expressions of a mind full of resignation, humility, and faith. He never loved to talk of himself, — and death-bed gossip was his abhorrence. Whatever he said came so in the natural course of remark, that it is only by retracing general conversations that anything of the kind can be recalled. There was, to the last hour of his life, a calm dignity, a naturalness, and a self-possession, to which I recur with increasing astonishment.

"How full his heart was of love towards others, how much more he ever thought of them than of himself, the youngest of you, who knew him with any intimacy, must have seen and felt. How engrossing to his thoughts and affections were the welfare and improvement of the people of his charge we all know. The pains and debility of sickness, so far from excluding these subjects from his mind, seemed chiefly felt inasmuch as they debarred him from ministering to the service of his beloved flock. Only a few evenings before his death he sent for me expressly to mention a kindness which he had for some time wished to perform for one of his society, but to which, finding death was about to prevent his ever performing it, he wished me to attend. This was done when speaking was almost agony to him.

"But why do I go on thus? I must restrain myself, or I shall defeat my chief object, which was to impress deeply upon your thought a few points in the character of him whom we lament, which you, as well as others, are capable of imitating. His whole character is the rich legacy which he has left us; and, profuse as were his efforts to do us good while he was with us, if we faithfully use this bequest, we shall find it a treasure exhaustible only with the mine from which he drew all its riches."

"Are we ready to exclaim, 'Help, Lord, for the godly man ceaseth'? — Let us not forget that there is indeed help with God. Let no desponding thoughts find place in our minds for ourselves, for society, or for the church. Remember how he said, while he was yet with us, — how often he said it, when clouds of gloom seemed to overhang every prospect, — 'God loves his own cause better than we can love it, and he will never forsake it.'"

After these specimens, we believe our readers will agree with us in the opinion that the writer of this Address could hardly perform a more acceptable service to the church than to give an extended biography of Dr. Parker, a work for which, we repeat it, we are sure no one can be better qualified in all essential respects. We hope very soon to learn that the work is undertaken.

G. Nichols.

CORRESPONDENCE AND INTELLIGENCE.

A LETTER ON THE COLDNESS OF NEW-ENGLAND PREACHING.

MESSRS. EDITORS,

Were it not that I have appeared as a contributor in your periodical, I would tell you that I like it much and believe that it will do great good. What I like in your plan is, that you propose to speak a plain and direct language to *the people*. The people have too often been overlooked, or courted only for base purposes. Preachers and writers too frequently address themselves only to the few, and glad am I that you propose to speak for and to the many.

I wish you would undeceive the public on a point of some consequence to us New-Englanders. You know we are called a cold, unfeeling people. When we complain of the style of sermonizing usually adopted by our clergy, and ask why it is not as bold, glowing, breathing, impassioned as that of the south and west, we are told, our cold northern manner forbids it. Now I do not believe a word of this. I know the New-England character; I know the New-England climate is cold; I know the wind that comes over her bleak hills and granite mountains is cold; I know that the exterior of her sons and daughters is cold; but she has a soul of fire. No part of our country presents a population more susceptible, not of a crackling fanaticism, but of a deep and burning enthusiasm. Nowhere else will you find that restlessness, that eternal desire to grasp something which they have not — that sure indication of the soul's thirst for perfection — in a greater degree than in New England, cold, calculating, mercenary as she has been called.

Where live the American poets? where the most popular and thrillingly eloquent of American prose-writers? I answer not; but whoever does answer will refute the false impression gone abroad against New England. Where, again, were born those eloquent men of the west? Who were their parents? What is the west, but a child of New England? Do you ask why the child surpasses the mother? I answer, simply because the mother is the slave of etiquette, while the child indulges freely all the promptings of the soul, — now following its grave, now its frolicsome, humour; laughing when pleased, crying when grieved; and often passing from the laughing to the crying, and from the crying to the laughing, so rapidly, that smiles and tears are frequently mingled. Let the mother break the fetters which restrain the motions of her soul, and she will yet prove herself worthy of her child.

The great fault of our northern eloquence is not chargeable to the people, but to our orators. I thought when I came into New England that the people were incapable of feeling the power of eloquence. It was one of my hasty thoughts, drawn from the first appearance. No people can feel genuine eloquence better than New Englanders. Go where you will, the churches demand it. The great complaint against our clergy, a complaint almost universal, — not among strangers, but among ourselves, — is, that our clergy want life, want earnestness, want boldness and directness. I hear this everywhere. The people are hungering aud thirsting for a more efficient ministry; they are dying for the want of that warm, bold, energetic manner which it is said our northern manner forbids.

Am I wrong? Have our clergy tried the experiment? Have they

been too eloquent, too pungent in their appeals to conscience, too direct in their applications of the threatenings of the Divine law, too consoling in speaking of the promises of the gospel? Have they been too impassioned, too forgetful of self, and of everything but the subject they would bring home to men's minds and hearts? If they have, if they have gone so far as to be called extravagant, then I withdraw my complaint.

To me there is something almost criminal in this coldness in the pulpit. What is the minister's duty? What does he see? A world lying in wickedness, death raging, friends and brothers dying, dying in sin, while he holds in his hand the remedy, that which saves from sin and imparts a life which is forever. He sees the sinner on the brink of the precipice, now raising his foot for the step which dashes him to pieces. Can he wait to cull the words in which to admonish him of his danger? stop to round the period in which to tell him to "Hold! another step is death"? No; he cannot, if he sees the danger. He who sees the awful condition of the sinner, who feels the magnitude of the evil of sin, cannot stop to select his words, to round and polish his periods, and cull the flowers of elocution, which will fade ere a soul can feel their beauty. No, he will speak right on. He will pour out his whole soul, in a stream of strong, rushing, overwhelming eloquence. He will see nothing but the sinner and his peril, the sinner and his means of safety; he will not, when he sees the sinner writhing with agonies of remorse, or ready to be enveloped in the flames of that fire which shall not be quenched, stop to correct his syntax, and to model his pronunciation after the latest approved standard. No; he will call mightily upon God to help; he will call upon the sinner; he will bid him flee from danger; to run, and to run for his life to the city of refuge, in tones that shall thrill through the soul and sink deep into the heart. We want ministers who see and feel, and will speak in this manner. The state of the world demands a ministry that can forget everything but Christ and him crucified. Let us have such a ministry. Let it speak loudly and earnestly, in strong, nervous, bold, glowing, burning language; and cold as is our northern manner, we will put up with it, and thank God for it.—Forgive me these hasty remarks and believe me yours truly,

O. A. Brownson.

THE WEST AS A FIELD OF USEFULNESS FOR YOUNG PREACHERS OF THE UNITARIAN DENOMINATION.

A Letter to the Editors, dated Louisville, Jan. 7th, 1834.

I wish to say a few words, through your work, to those young men of my own profession whose thoughts have been directed to the west as a sphere for their ministerial labours. Before I came out here myself I heard the most contradictory opinions in regard to the expediency of this step. Some thought the west the Garden of Eden; by others it was likened to the Desert of Sahara. One declared that rational and liberal Christianity *must* and *would* spread through this region as the autumnal flames flash along its prairies. Another answered that the grossest fanaticism and most intolerant bigotry were the characteristics of western religion. To reconcile such statements was impossible; one could only balance them, and try to keep an unprejudiced mind, and think nothing beforehand about it. Such was my aim; and I wish now to throw in my opinion among the rest, formed on the experience of the last five months.

Is it advisable for a young man of liberal views to go out to the west as a preacher?

It is not, and it is.

1. It is not if he delights in large audiences. Rational Christianity does not collect large audiences in the west. It is enthusiasm, exaggeration, extreme statements, vivid colouring, glow and passion, which collect crowds. To be sure, if a man happens to be an orator, as has been the case with some of our preachers who have visited these parts, he will be sure to gain admiration; for in no part of the United States is there to be found a stronger love, or indeed a finer and more correct taste for oratory, than in the west, — in particular, Kentucky. But suppose the friend for whom I write to be no orator, but a sincere man, of average abilities, who desires to preach his Master rather than himself. In this case he can console himself with the distich of the poet,

> "Let the fanatic gather disciples like sand on the sea-shore;
> Sand is but sand, but thou art a pearl, thou my *rational friend*."

Rational Christianity certainly shows no intention of flying over the west like wildfire. I fear that, like most other truths, our views must be propagated by our own efforts. "Such labour has God appointed for men."

2. So let no young man come to the west who is afraid to work. In order to produce the least effect on the minds of this rather volatile and changeable race, he must task himself night and day, in every manner, to advance his cause and finish his work. To be obliged to do this, to be necessitated to lay aside habits of sloth and assume those of industry, is, as wise men look on it, an advantage.

3. Lastly, the west is no place for a man whose tastes are unchangeably fixed, and whose habits of feeling and acting are rigidly cast and hardened, and who cannot open his mind to new impressions, or bear up in the lack of the accustomed comforts and loved objects of home. Western manners, customs, feelings are different from eastern, yet in their way they are good, and will strike an unprejudiced mind as such, if it can bear the first shock of novelty. But if a young man can renounce present success, can work, and can forget home, the west is just the country where he will be happy, useful, and improving.

1. For in the first place, he will be pleased with the society by which he is surrounded. He will miss, perhaps, much of the culture and depth of acquirement of the east; but in their place he will find openness and liberality of mind, as great extent of information, and a very active, inquiring, and improving spirit. He will miss that love and patronage of established institutions which he left behind, but will find their place supplied by greater energy of individual character. He will be surprised to find how much is said, done, and thought, in a single day, by western people; how much change and enterprise and activity surround him. He will probably gain more knowledge of mankind in a month here, than in a year in New England. He will be pleased with finding hospitality, liberality, and frankness of manners, in the place of the exclusiveness and envy and rigour of *caste* which pervade New-England society. Here they act wholly or almost wholly on the principle,

> "The rank is but the guinea-stamp,
> The *man*'s the gowd, for a' that."

2. He will have the pleasure, therefore, of finding himself improving. He will gain a self-confidence founded on self-knowledge. For he will freely act himself out, regardless of the expectations and demands of others. In New England he could hardly avoid saying — I am expected to speak thus and so, to do this and that. Here nothing in particular is expected; there are no fixed tastes and opinions, and settled, regular demands, to fetter the activity of the individual. It is only expected that he will do something, what and how are left to himself. No set of opinions or tastes has become dominant; all are militant. This, then, seems just the state of society where a young man can best put that important finishing-part to his education which consists in practising self-dependence. "In New England," a friend once remarked to me, "we are like stones wedged

in an arch; at the west each one stands like a tree, supported by nothing but its own roots." The remark is very true.

3. Thirdly, the opportunity of useful action in our profession and the prospect of future usefulness are ten times as great here as at the east. There all things are fixed; here they are fixing; an influence exerted now will be felt in the future institutions of this country. Here, too, everything is advancing with gigantic strides, and everyone who will persevere with a determined spirit will take his share of the growth of the country.

I must here insist on the duty, as I think it, of our body to establish churches *now* in the principal western cities. There are Unitarians everywhere, but not enough anywhere to build a church and support a preacher without assistance. Six hundred dollars paid by the Association or other Unitarians to support a preacher one year in St. Louis would certainly establish a church there. Why will they not do this? Let them try this as an experiment, and, if it succeed, proceed to some of the other cities. The objection which is urged against such measures at the east does not apply here. No old church is to be broken up; those who will attend our church would go nowhere else. There are two millions of persons in this valley who belong to no church; can money be employed better than in providing for them? How little this is, compared with what is laid out by other denominations! What I now propose is, in the opinion of all our friends here, a measure demanded by the times. They go so far as to say, "Let the Association expend all the money collected for the salary of their agent, in sending agents *now* over this country, and it will be returned to them tenfold by the new Auxiliaries which they will establish all through the Union." I am disposed to think with them.

I must finish with a single word respecting the opposition we meet with. It is *great*, undoubtedly, here as elsewhere, but I think less intolerant than at the east. I think that one who should seek distinction here in Mr. Cheever's fashion, by arrogant attacks on the good and wise, would receive the contempt of all parties. Wishing you success in your enterprise, I remain yours,

JAMES F. CLARKE.

Extracts from a Letter dated Richmond, Jan. 6th, 1834.

As to our society, it is, I am happy to inform you, in a very healthy and flourishing condition. Prejudice is every day giving way, a better feeling begins to be manifested towards us, the ladies venture to attend in respectable numbers, and the church is, in general, well attended both in regard to numbers and respectability. I have now a very extended acquaintance through the state. A highly respectable body of the members of the House of Delegates are my regular hearers and most hearty friends.

You inquire respecting Charlottesville. I hear from our friends there often, and have received many pressing solicitations to visit that place, Lynchburgh, and several other important places in the state. But my time is wholly taken up with my society. I might greatly advance my personal interests by leaving Virginia. But I do not feel satisfied to do so. It presents a broad field for usefulness, though but a poor one for pecuniary recompense. I wish that some preacher could come here from among our northern brethren. Charlottesville would be a grand station. I fear it would be difficult to furnish sufficient inducements to command the talents required; for an ordinary preacher would not meet the wants and intelligence of that polished community.

Your prospectus was received several days since. I am well pleased that you have undertaken a work so much needed, especially in this quarter, and nothing that I can do, to promote its circulation, shall be want-

ing. We have had serious thoughts of establishing a press in this city. A gentleman every way competent to the task of superintending it can be procured, and my friends would contribute liberally to the establishment of an office. From my success in the short excursions and slight efforts I have hitherto made to procure support for *The Pioneer*, I am well satisfied that I might obtain fifteen hundred subscribers by travelling and preaching a few months in the warm season. But my society must not be left without preaching; and, under all considerations, we have pretty much concluded to abandon the scheme. Your paper may have an ample support in this quarter alone, if you can employ some one to make a business of getting subscribers for it. I would, with all my heart, extend it widely, if my hands were not so completely tied by the constant demand made upon my time by my rapidly increasing congregation.

J. B. PITKIN.

Extract from a Letter from Worcester County, Massachusetts, dated H——, January 29, 1834.

Everything goes on prosperously with us, and our prospects are certainly *promising*. A number of families have lately left the Calvinistic meeting and come to ours; they have already signified their intention of joining our society in the spring. Ten were added to our church on the first Sabbath in this month, and it is expected a number more will offer themselves soon. My people manifest an increasing attention to religion, and we have what I consider a *real* revival of pure and *undefiled* religion, although we have no "inquiry," no "anxious," no "whispering" meetings, nor yet any "concerts of prayer," to pray down other sects or heretical seminaries.

The Calvinists in this place held a "four days' meeting" last fall, which, I think, was much more beneficial to us than to them. The Sunday before it commenced, I preached an extemporary sermon to my people from the text, "Let them alone," and my people took the hint, and governed themselves accordingly. To that sermon the Calvinists attribute a great share of their failure! Can it be possible that a feeble worm, and "*damnable heretic*" too, can prevent the ALMIGHTY from reviving his work whenever he pleases!!

At the close of the meeting, as I am informed, Mr. G. (whether provoked with *me* or with the *people*, or with the *Lord*, I cannot say) arose and said, "All who are determined to go to hell are desired to withdraw; those who wish to follow the Saviour, to remain for religious instruction." People, as you may suppose, were so disgusted, that nearly all left immediately.

WILMINGTON, DELAWARE.

A friend in Philadelphia, in a letter dated *Jan.* 30, writes:

"I have heard repeatedly that a liberal society might be formed at Wilmington, Delaware. There are many Hicksites there."

LECTURES ON THE EVIDENCES AND ON UNITARIANISM.

At the request of the Young Men's Society, a course of Sunday-evening lectures on the evidences of natural and revealed religion is being delivered in Boston by clergymen of different denominations. Three have already been preached, which are said to have been very able and conclusive, and attracted very large audiences. The public interest in

these subjects is daily increasing. We understand that a similar course is about to be delivered in Salem, and we presume that the example will soon be followed in other places. The Rev. Mr. Whitman, of Waltham, is giving a series of extemporary lectures on infidelity, in his own town, which we hope will be repeated elsewhere.

These lectures, we think, will be eminently useful, — not so much on account of the convincing arguments for the truth of our religion which they present, since little more than general impressions can be made by public discourses, — but because they tend to excite the public mind to a more careful examination of its evidences. They will teach the skeptical that Christianity is not so utterly destitute of proof but that there may be something in it, and that its foundations cannot be shaken by the crude objections and unfounded assertions which are afloat in the community. We had some further remarks to make in this connection, but our limits will not permit.

Believing the diffusion of better views of theology than have heretofore prevailed to be one of the most powerful antidotes to infidelity, we are glad to learn that public lectures on the great points of Unitarianism are being delivered in several places. The Rev. E. S. Gannett has been preaching doctrinal discourses for some time past in Boston to large audiences, and Dr. Nichols, of Portland, Maine, has been delivering lectures on the same topics for the last two or three months in his own church, which have been well attended by persons of all denominations, and have produced some very gratifying results, especially in enlightening the public mind on the true character of Unitarianism. J. Q. D.

THE AGENCY OF THE AMERICAN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION.

We have the satisfaction of announcing that the Rev. Jason Whitman of Saco, Maine — one of the editors of this work — has been appointed Agent of the American Unitarian Association, and will accept the appointment. He enters upon the duties of the office immediately.

We look upon the establishment of this agency as being decidedly the most important step which has been taken by the A. U. A., on account of the results which may be expected from it. The periodical visits of the Agent to all our churches, in all parts of the United States, cannot fail, we think, to draw more closely the bonds which unite them, and to awaken in them a more hearty interest both in one another and in their common object. The cause of Christ has suffered incalculably among us for the want of such an agency. We thank God, from our hearts, that this want is now to be supplied; and that measures, which promise to be in some sort efficient, are now to be taken, for sending the gospel in something of its truth and purity and sanctifying power through our land. May God bless his work! G. N.

A Correspondent in Northumberland County, Pennsylvania, proposes the following

QUERIES:

1. To what *coming* did our Lord refer in Matthew xvi. 27, 28? Do these verses refer to one or two appearances of Christ?

2. Upon what principle do Christian ministers *now* pray for the holy spirit? The querist has been accustomed to consider this expression, wherever it occurs in the New Testament, as having a reference to some extraordinary or miraculous gift.

INSTALLATION. — January 1st, Rev. A. D. Jones was installed as pastor of the Congregational Church and Society in Wilton, N. H. Sermon by Rev. Mr. Gage of Nashua, N. H. Text, 2 Peter, i. 17. "For he received from God, the Father, honour and glory."

New Books just received by James Munroe and Co.

The Class-Book of Anatomy, designed for Schools; explanatory of the First Principles of Human Mechanism. With illustrations. By J. V. C. Smith, M. D.
The Library of American Biography. Edited by Jared Sparks.
The Promise of Universal Peace, a Sermon by Rev. Henry Ware, Jr.
The Writings of Washington, edited by Jared Sparks. Vols. II. and III.
Watson's Body of Practical Divinity.
Winslow on the Trinity.
Wood and Bache's United-States' Dispensatory.

JAMES MUNROE & Co. have for sale the following Theological Works: —

Jeremy Taylor's Complete Works.
Barrows' Works.
Sherlock's, do.
Hall's do.
Butler's do.
Lightfoot's do.
Lardner's do.
Doddridge's do.
Paley's do.
Priestley's do.
Price's do.
Leighton's do.
Horsley's do.
Porteus's do.
Tillotson's do.
Blair's do.
Chalmers's do.
Fenelon's do.
Bossuet's do.
Massillon's do.
Newland's Analysis of the Thirty-nine Articles.
Burnet on do. do.
Rees's Racovian Catechism.
Farmer on the Temptation.
——— on Miracles.
——— on Demoniacs.
Marsh's Michaelis.
Jebb's Works.
Cogan's do.
Hartley on Man.
Pascal's Thoughts.
Gleig's History of the Bible.
Herder's Works.
Sparks's Tracts.
History of the Huguenots.
Boetius's Consolations.
Burnet's History of the Reformation.
Claude's do. do.
Wardlaw on the Socinian Controversy.
Blackwall's Sacred Classics.
Waddington's Church History.
Hengstenberg's Christologie.
Griesbachii Symbolæ Criticæ.
Calmet's Dictionary of the Bible, 4to.
Ernesti's Institutes of Interpretation.
Le Clerc, Ars Critica.
Jenning's Jewish Antiquities.
Jahn's Archæology.
——— Hebrew Commonwealth.
Fleury's Manners and Customs of the Israelites.
Burder's Oriental Customs.
Cudworth's Intellectual System.
Campbell on Revelation.
Michaelis, Hebrew Bible.
Hahn, do. do.
Diodati's Bible,
Castalio's do.
Greek Septuagint.
Antwerp Polyglott.
Latin Vulgate.
Wetstein, Novum Testamentum.
Knapp, do. do.
Griesbach, do. do.
Beausobre and L'Enfant, New Testament.
Bloomfield's Critical Digest of the New Testament.
Bowyer's Critical Conjectures on do.
Eichhorn, Old and New Testament.
Patrick and Lowth's Commentary on the Sacred Scriptures.
Wells's do. do.
Kuinoel, Comment. New Testament.
Rosenmüller, do. do.
Do. do. Old Testament.
Gesenius on Isaiah.
Taylor on Romans.
Wakefield on Matthew.
Porteus on do.
Blayney's Jeremiah.
Trollope's Analecta Sacra.
Macknight on the Epistles.
Gillies' New Testament.
Lowman on Revelation.
Jahn's Introduction to Old Testament.
Carpenter's do. to Sacred Scriptures.
Hug's do. to New Testament.
Simon's Hebrew Lexicon.
Gesenius, do. do
Schleusner, Lexicon to New Testament.
Biel's Thesaurus.
Schmidt's Concordance to the Greek Testament.
Buxtorf's Hebrew Concordance.
Theological Repository.
General Repository.
Christian Disciple, Old and New Series.
Do. Examiner, Old and New Series.
Unitarian Miscellany.
Do. Advocate.
Biblical Repository.
Scriptural Interpreter.

CONTENTS.

PAGE.

True and False Zeal. C. A. B. 207
Analogy of Debts and Sins. NOAH WORCESTER, D. D. 213
Study of the Scriptures. A. P. PEABODY. 215
The Coming of the Son of Man. H. B. GOODWIN. 220
Manufactures in their Influence upon Pauperism. No. I. *Small Manufacturing Establishments.* J. H. MORISON. 224
Letters to Unbelievers. No. IV. *Religious Opinions of Thomas Jefferson.* THE EDITOR. 227

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Taylor's *Social Evils and their Remedy.* O. A. BROWNSON. 238
Philip's *Manly Piety, in its Principles.* THE EDITOR. 245
The Christian Knowledge Society's Tracts. J. Q. DAY. 248
Works in Press. — Goodwin's Sermons. Parker's Sermons. New Edition of the Bible. 249

CORRESPONDENCE AND INTELLIGENCE.

Infidel Missionaries. 250
Letter from Buffalo, New York. 250
Extracts of Letters from a Mormonite. 251
Letter from Berkshire County. 253
Theological Discussion in Boston. 254

THE UNITARIAN is issued in monthly numbers, by JAMES MUNROE and Co., *Cambridge, Mass.* Each number will contain, on an average, 48 pages royal 12mo., [i. e. octavo size], and be printed on good paper and with handsome type. The price will be two dollars per annum, payable on the first of March. To those who procure and become responsible for six subscribers a seventh copy will be furnished *gratis.* The usual discount to Agents. All business letters to be addressed to the publishers.

Our Subscribers are reminded that payment became due on the receipt of the March number. Gentlemen to whom subscription-papers were sent are respectfully requested to collect and forward to the publishers, James Munroe & Co., Cambridge, Mass., the amount due from the several subscribers whose names they have sent us.

It is particularly requested of our subscribers to make their payments in Massachusetts' or United States' Bank Notes; since the discount on all other bills involves a considerable loss.

It is intended to notice all the books and pamphlets which may be received, so far as they fall within the plan of this work. It is, therefore, respectfully requested of authors and publishers to forward copies of such publications.

The Editor will hold himself responsible for no articles except his own.

NOTICE.

The Subscriber hereby gives notice that his interest in business with the firm of Messrs. James Munroe & Co., Booksellers to the University, Cambridge, having been transferred to Mr. John Owen, his connexion with said firm is this day dissolved by consent of parties.

GEORGE FISKE.

In conformity with the abovementioned arrangement, the Subscribers respectfully announce that they have this day received Mr. John Owen into copartnership in their business of Booksellers to the University, the style of their firm being continued as heretofore.

JAMES MUNROE, JR.
GEORGE NICHOLS.

Cambridge, May 1, 1834.

THE UNITARIAN.

VOL. I. MAY 1, 1834. No. 5.

True and False Zeal.

WE hear much said of the coldness of New-England preaching, and the March number of THE UNITARIAN contains a letter on the subject, to which we would ask the attention of those who have not read it. But *Unitarian* preaching is usually singled out as the special mark for this reproach of coldness and want of zeal. Unitarianism itself is attacked, while the lifeless exposition, which it is said to receive at the hands of its ministers, is pretendedly traced to its efficient causes. The system itself is said to be dead and heartless, and we are told there is no wonder it should in its exhibition appear as it is, corpse-like and cold. We shall not stop to consider this strain of self-refuting taunt which is so often rung in our ears, but shall make it the occasion of some remarks upon zeal in general, leaving others to draw their own conclusions.

Paul tells us "it is good to be zealously affected in a good thing," and, as we make no question that Christianity is a *good thing*, it becomes all, who acknowledge its truth, to promote its spread. Now to be zealously affected in the work evidently is to engage in it with earnestness and ardour. So far, doubtless, all would agree. But there may be difference of opinion as to the true meaning of this earnestness and ardour. In a given case one man might affirm its existence while another should assert its absence. And we apprehend that to be a great and hurtful error which regards true zeal in religion as inconsistent with calmness, thus establishing an opposition between feeling and reason, and making our nature a kingdom divided against itself. Perhaps some have even thought it necessary to beware of having too much feeling, lest it

should despoil them of calm and sober rationality, — as if calmness were not thoroughly consistent with the most intense emotion, and as if feeling were to be narrowed down in its meaning to the mere foam of extravagance and the ravings of insanity, to groans and shrieks, to tossings of the arms, and writhings of the body, — as if, in short, that true zeal which a Christian preacher should seek were made up, half of excited passion, and half of mere physical action. Now we undertake to say not only that these exhibitions are not the sole evidence of just and strong feeling, but that they do not betoken the most powerful emotion. Indeed, they are often signs of a mere childish weakness and weeping and imbecility. Nay, they may be found in connexion with coldness of heart, and are as consistent with deadness and want of motion and warmth in its real living depths, as all the anger and ostentation and fury of the frothy billows are with the cold, dead, motionless rocks around which they break. The heart may stand out hard and immovable while all this excitement of the outer man rages and dashes about it. What a freezing effect must be produced, in such a case, upon those who actually perceive the excitement to be artificial! But take those who have not a doubt as to the real earnestness and sincerity of the speaker, — how and to what degree are they excited at such times? With all their confidence in the preacher, their excitement must, in a great measure, be like his. They may mistake their physical agitation for a deep movement of the soul; they may think their groans extorted when they unconsciously, but really, take pains to utter them; they may not distinguish the shriek of nervous hysteric pain from that which comes from agony of spirit. But effects must correspond to their causes. It is not every tone that, being indeed a tone of feeling, goes to the living heart of the hearer and regulates its motions; it is not a flinging of the arms at random that can express or convey a resistless energy of love and holy purpose. Emotions must strongly act on the inner man before they can appear in their own strong natural language in the countenance; and when the occasion is a real occasion, when the object is, and is understood to be, to excite men to action and effort of mind and life, and not to furnish them with a luxurious enjoyment of mere tragical scenes, strong feeling must exist in the soul of the speaker before it can be conveyed to the soul of the hearer. The preacher may desire to express an unfathomable love or joy or grief, but these must be seen to be unfathomable

before the great assembly can sympathize with them by the experience of emotions alike unbounded.

It is said of the zeal of which we have been speaking, that, however blameworthy it may be on account of its excesses, it is not at all liable to the charge of coldness. If that zeal be entitled to the praise of a warm and animating zeal, which rouses the tumultuous passions of the soul, which mingles the deep tide of human desires and hopes in furious commotion, the remark may be true. But there is a zeal — let each man judge for himself where it is exhibited — which is hot and consuming, rather than cheering and vivifying to the noblest powers and affections of the soul. It is a flame that rages like the fire in autumnal woods, laying waste everything fair and glorious within its reach, and leaving what was just now so bright and beautiful to coldness and darkness and desolation. As in the case of the forest-conflagration, the sun with his calm yet powerful light and heat must toil days and months with a steady patience to bring back the green and smiling beauty of the landscape, so must the power of a calm and equable zeal shed its choicest influence on the soul ere she can regain the beauty that has been marred, and be clothed anew in the verdure that has been blighted.

But is not strong excitement the very thing we need in religion? Do not men need to have their souls moved to their very depths? Do they not require to have their consciences startled from slumber, their feelings aroused, and the powers of their minds summoned forth into active duty? Should not the preacher's address to them be piercing and thrilling? With all our heart we say, Yes! But is all this best effected by a fiery and unregulated zeal, — a zeal which has no enduring strength, no character for uniformity, but consists in convulsions of soul and convulsions of body? Or is it best effected by a zeal that is calm, orderly, self-subsistent, and abiding? Which of these kinds of zeal are we to prefer? The latter, by all means. We should prefer it because its calmness is the calmness of power, because it moves with a clear-sighted view of the object, and of the obstacle, too, which opposes its course, and is thus a zeal "according to knowledge." We should prefer it because of its constancy, because it is not a brawling brook of the surface, which will soon show a dry and parched channel, but the strong and unfailing, though silent, stream from an exhaustless fountain. The *furious* zealot expends all his feeling, he makes a show of his *whole heart*, he pours out all his emotion on his bodily

movements and gestures. This excites in the hearer only a violent and short-lived sympathy. But he whose zeal is as calm as it is deep operates in a widely different manner and to far better purpose. He gathers in and restrains the fulness of his heart lest it should overpower the external man. He subdues his emotion lest his emotion should subdue him. So deep is his affection for the souls of his hearers that he almost fears to speak and tell them how deep it is. He presses it back into his heart, though his heart be full to bursting. The affection which is expressed seems to overflow its bounds, refusing any longer to be restrained within them. This is the zeal of a love that is boundless and unfathomable. This is the zeal which, with all its calmness and self-restraint, produces not only strong but right excitement, — which moves the soul to its depths though the movement be not like the roaring of winds and the lashing of billows, but while it is unseen and unheard, is yet of mighty, yea, incalculable energy. This is the zeal which binds the soul of the hearer to the soul of the preacher, and to the duties and hopes of its existence, in bonds which not the wasting action of an hour, or a life, or a death, or an eternity shall sever.

It is this inexpressible and almost fearful interest in and affection for the souls of our fellow-creatures, which, with a power as calm as that which preserves the steady glory of the firmament, draws them to the embrace of Christian affection. They long to know how much of sympathy and love lies in the preacher's heart beyond that which he can express, which he dares express. Their sympathy has an anxious curiosity to know the fulness and power of his sympathy, — and how much of affection on their part is included in this curiosity! We appeal to everyone's experience in this question of zeal. We ask, Have not the most thrilling appeals been made when the strength expended in physical action and movement might have been supplied, we were going to say by the arm of an infant? Have not tones as gentle as a zephyr's murmur reached even to the inner chambers of the heart, and there taking up a kind of spiritual existence have they not preserved themselves in ceaseless echoes, and called, like voices from another world, to repentance and holiness of life? We speak not here from any mere excitement of the fancy. For ourselves we can, with the most sober and literal truth, answer these questions in the affirmative. Oh, when the Christian preacher's own spirit is ordered aright, when his heart is imbued and pervaded with the holy influences of his

faith, there is a love and zeal which need not to be arrayed in any exterior pomp of language and gesture. They need not to be attested by extravagant demonstrations of passion, by the groans of a morbid and unearthly agony, or by nerves and muscles wrought up to a physical frenzy.

We have exhibited very briefly two kinds of zeal, or two modes of presenting and impressing religious truth, in contrast with each other. We would by no means intimate that all preachers are marked entirely by one or the other of these kinds of zeal as we have described them. Still we know, as all must know, that there are both theoretical and practical errors as to what is the best and most efficient zeal, and it becomes everyone to consider how far he has receded from that zeal which is pure and elevated, while at the same time it is characterized by a ceaseless activity and a burning enthusiasm, and how near he has approached to the zeal of extravagance and fury and moral intoxication. But error and danger in this matter lie on both sides. On both sides we apprehend there is actual mistake committed, and actual harm done. It is wrong in itself and destructive to the souls of men to identify emotion with frenzy, power with tumult, piety with extravagance; but it is perhaps equally wrong and injurious to suppose that what is calm must be energetic, or that there may not be a clear and cold rationality without a warm and glowing piety. And for ourselves we confess we look with more pleasure or with less pain upon ill-judged and morbid excitement, if it arise from real feeling, if the extravagance be the honest extravagance of the heart, and the whole do not better merit the appellation of a mere tragic show, than we look upon this spiritual coldness and deadness. If the alternative be presented, we would rather the intellect might be consumed in the heart than the heart frozen in the intellect. But, thanks to Him who framed our nature, the alternative is not presented, nor will it be so long as man's reason can enlighten and purify his feelings, so long as his feelings can cherish and exalt his reason.

We began with mentioning the reproach which is cast on Unitarians on account of the coldness of their system and the coldness of their preaching. We think that a candid mind would so apply some of the suggestions which have been made as to remove, in a great measure, that reproach. Still we do not claim for Unitarians even a perfectly just and right zeal, — a quality which when possessed by a whole sect would, in our apprehension, go far towards proving that sect

to have reached the pure truth, and which, in individuals, is one of the rarest attainments of the Christian character. But how is that zeal to be acquired which shall act both on Christians and on ungodly men with the most thrilling and soul-stirring energy? We answer generally, and for the sake of distinction in terms somewhat technical, — by adding to the love of truth the love of souls. Our business is not simply to seek after all knowledge with persevering ardour, not simply to welcome it to our embrace when found, and to let it purify our own minds, but we are to apply it to the souls of "our brethren, our kinsmen according to the flesh," and in its application we are to labour and suffer, and, if need be, die. Our silent study by the midnight lamp is to be endured for those whose bodies and souls are wrapt in slumber, our vigils prolonged in anxiety for the salvation of a sleeping world. We are not to be selfish solitaries who have shrunk away in disgust from the touch of human feeling and from connexion with human sympathy, but we are to mingle our life and thought with the life and thought of the world about us. We are to be, in the expression already used, lovers not only of truth but of human souls. Some seem to imagine that by withdrawing from a near communion with the weak, ignorant, and sinful men about them — who, weak, ignorant, and sinful as they are, have annexed to their souls the fearful condition of immortality — they shall induce truth to visit them with higher communications. But let them recollect that she has no sympathy with unkind and selfish souls. However brilliant their fancy and tender their susceptibilities, — and, strange to think, such a fancy and such susceptibilities sometimes belong to those who have also the unkindness and selfishness of which we speak, — truth, with her large and generous spirit, finds their minds too narrow for her abode. She loves those most and blesses with her most ample revelations those who look with affection and with fellow-feeling on all, who embrace the whole of humanity in their regards; fellow-feeling, we say, for there is a sort of ideal, imaginative kindness which has little connexion with what we mean by generous fellow-feeling. Many, who would fain believe themselves universal philanthropists, and into the constitution of whose souls affection does in truth enter largely, are yet very far from having, or *desiring* to have, a real communion of soul with their species. They have a universal *kindness*, but they have not, and seem hardly desirous of having, a universal sympathy. Their affection

seems to be abstract, inactive, unapplied. Oh, let them remember, that for such an affection, they have no more merit than for being made in the shape of men rather than of brutes, — no more merit than for having within them noble dispositions and the image of God instead of being endowed with base propensities and a beastly nature. Would they please God, bless their race, and save their own souls? They must give to their affection a definite and an extensive application by the energy of a virtuous will. The world needs no theoretical philanthropy, — none of that imaginative sympathy which is too selfish to endure the presence of misery, and would have all objects of wretchedness removed from its sight lest the luxury of its own ideal bliss should be disturbed, which ever avoids being introduced to a soul that needs instruction and comfort lest it should have to abandon its own self-occupation and self-delight, — none of those good hearts whose goodness is consistent and almost identical with indifference to the interests of humanity, and which, while they could enjoy their solitary satisfaction, would be rent with little anguish were the whole world to sink away from them down to the place of despair. No! those are wanted who will have a warm, practical, earnest, and even *agonizing* sympathy with human souls, those who can weep, as did the Saviour over the devoted city, over those who will not know "the things which belong unto their peace," — those who shall "thank God that their own lot is bound up in that of the human race."

C. A. B.

Analogy of Debts and Sins.

The word *debts*, as used in the prayer which Christ taught his disciples, and in the parable of the king who would take account of his servants, justifies the belief that there is some analogy between debts and moral trespasses or sins. Were there no analogy between the two, we should see no propriety in the petition, "Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors," nor between the parable and its moral as given by our Lord himself. For in both cases debts are metaphorically used to represent sins.

There are different senses in which men may become in-

debted to each other, and different ways of becoming indebted. I become indebted to my neighbour when I purchase anything of him for which I promise to pay a certain sum of money. I may also become indebted to him by receiving favours for which he demands no compensation. This, however, is a debt of gratitude, and of a different nature from the other. In the latter sense, children are greatly indebted to kind parents; and we are all in the same sense indebted to God. Such debts are not in themselves sins. They, however, bring us under moral obligations to love and obey our Maker. By disregarding these obligations, or by neglecting or refusing to obey his precepts, we are guilty of sin, and become exposed to the penalty of his law.

Debts and sins are in some respects analogous; in others they are not. They are analogous, as each implies *obligations uncancelled*, and as each may be *forgiven*. In some other respects they are not analogous. A debt may be paid and thus cancelled, either by the debtor or his surety or friend; but sin cannot be paid or cancelled, either by the sinner or by any third person. If not forgiven, its penalty must be inflicted on the sinner himself. The principles of justice, which are the principles of the divine government, do not permit that one should be punished as a substitute for another, nor that any man should be punished for any sin but his own. The son shall not be punished for the sin of his father; nor the father for the sin of his son; nor the innocent as a substitute for the guilty. The Lord has said, "The soul that sinneth it shall die"; and he has explained the words as meaning that one shall not die for the sin of another, but every man shall die for his own sins, *except he repent*. Particular care, however, was taken to have it understood that God has no pleasure in the death of the wicked, and to assure us that his desire is that the wicked should repent, and that if they do repent they shall not perish. "When the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness that he hath committed, and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive." In this chapter, and in the thirty-third chapter of the same book, we have the last quoted sentiment several times repeated, with some diversity of form, that there may be no mistake in a matter so important. In one case it is said of the wicked man that repents, "All his transgressions that he hath committed, they shall not be mentioned unto him; *in his righteousness that he hath done he shall live.*" In another verse it is said, "But if the wicked

turn from his wickedness, and do that which is lawful and right, *he shall live thereby.*" — *Ezek.* xviii. 4, 27, 22; xxxiii. 19.

Multitudes of Christians, however, have supposed that the sufferings of Christ were a vicarious punishment inflicted by God for our sins, and that his sufferings are the only ground on which the sins of the penitent are forgiven. This hypothesis seems to me a plain contradiction to the revealed principles of divine government, as stated in Ezekiel. But this is not all. It supposes that punishment inflicted is the only ground of pardon under the divine government. Those who maintain this doctrine suppose that the sufferings of Christ were a substituted punishment, answering all the purposes which would have been answered by the endless punishment of all mankind. But let it be considered that *deserved punishment* is what is *remitted* in the *pardon of offences.* How, then, can punishment, after it is inflicted, be the ground of forgiveness? Would it not be folly for a man to say he forgave a debt, after it had been paid to the last mill? Is it not equally incorrect to suppose that God forgives our sins after Christ has borne the punishment due to them, and even makes that substituted punishment the ground of forgiveness?

Is it possible that intelligent men have duly reflected on this subject, and still believe that the wisdom and benevolence of God is displayed in making punishment inflicted the only ground of pardon? Must not a reflecting man be bewildered by strong prejudices if he can really believe that the same penalty is both *inflicted* and *forgiven?* Suppose forty stripes save one to be a just penalty for a certain crime; can that penalty be inflicted, and that infliction thus made the ground of forgiveness? What remains to be forgiven after the penalty is inflicted?

NOAH WORCESTER.

Study of the Scriptures.

What is requisite in order to render scriptural inquiry judicious and profitable? I answer, a clear understanding of the respective offices and mutual relations of reason and revelation, and also freedom from prejudice.

1. A clear understanding of the respective offices and mutual relations of reason and revelation.

Reason is that faculty of the mind which draws or approves conclusions from given premises. Revelation implies the discovery of what was before unknown, or the confirmation of what was previously open to doubt. Its office is to inform us of truths which were beyond the province of reason, or to assure us of truths which to the eye of reason were probable but not certain. At the present day two opposite faults prevail in the study of the Christian Scriptures. There are those who, while they admit the authority of reason in every other department, exclude it from religion; and there are those, on the other hand, who, forgetting that the mind knows not all things, and that reason can draw conclusions from known premises only, hold that we are bound to receive on the authority of revelation no truth the reasonableness of which is not perfectly obvious.

The first class of inquirers draw from Scripture, and feel themselves bound to believe doctrines which, as they themselves confess, are contrary to reason. But when is a doctrine contrary to reason? When from incontrovertible premises we draw a conclusion which cannot be true if that doctrine be true. Now I maintain that a revelation from God cannot teach such a doctrine. For whence did we derive the faculty which we now call reason? From God. And for what end did he bestow it? To guide us in belief and action. And what must be his purpose in giving us a revelation? To guide us in belief and action. Do reason and revelation contradict each other? If so, God has given us two inconsistent guides for belief and action. But this is impossible, if we believe the divine character is one of consistent veracity. If, therefore, we *admit* the divine veracity, we must reject one of these guides; or if we *doubt* it, we can depend upon neither. Thus the fact that its doctrines contradicted reason would be a sufficient ground for denying the divine authority of what purported to be a revelation from God.

But you may say that we cannot pass sentence upon a doctrine of divine revelation, because human reason is fallible and often leads to erroneous results. That it often leads to erroneous results everyone must admit. But I maintain that it is infallible, that every conclusion drawn by it follows necessarily from the premises from which it is derived, and that we are led to wrong conclusions simply because we

adopt wrong premises. It has been well observed that the fool reasons wrong even on right premises, and the madman right on wrong premises. Indeed the infallibility of his reason is the only thing which distinguishes the sane man from the idiot, and in many respects we are all madmen. On the most momentous subjects, with reference to the relations which we bear to God and eternity, we madly receive as truths propositions for which we have not the slightest evidence. Upon such premises we indeed reason correctly; but our conclusions may be false, may be absurd, since they are based upon premises which have not been submitted to the test of reason, upon false premises. Our systems of faith are thus like the house in the parable, skilfully framed, skilfully erected, but founded upon the sand, and therefore at the mercy of the first breath of wind or dash of the torrent's spray.

If, then, it is impossible that a revelation from God should teach doctrines contrary to reason, it is of prime importance in our study of the Christian Scriptures to ascertain whether they actually teach such doctrines. As firmly as I believe that they were written by holy men moved by the holy spirit, so firmly do I believe that they contain no such doctrines. But such have been drawn from single, disconnected passages. Such passages it is the duty of the inquirer after truth to compare with their context, and with the circumstances, modes of expression, and general purpose of the author; and he, who can thus enlighten himself or others as to the true meaning of a text which ignorance and party zeal have long quoted in support of an absurdity, does an essential service to our religion by depriving its adversaries of a valid argument against its divinity. Let us, then, in our scriptural researches ever remember that while God disciplines us in the midst of those things which are seen and temporal, he has made it the privilege, the noblest prerogative of reason, to interpret his oracles concerning things unseen and eternal.

But while we admit no doctrine contrary to reason, let us carefully guard against the opposite error, an unwillingness to receive, on the authority of Scripture, doctrines which might not have been rendered probable by reason independently of revelation. Reason is the power of drawing conclusions from given premises. But where no premises are given, no conclusion can be drawn. Revelation may communicate truth on subjects on which we previously had no premises whereon to ground a process of reasoning, on which we were previously

ignorant. And in that case it is our duty to follow implicitly the instructions of revelation, which we should not have needed at all had reason been able to take cognizance of all the sources of truth. On such subjects as the future destinies of the world, the state of the soul after death, the certainty, nature, and duration of future punishment, reason has no premises from which to draw its conclusions. Yet these are subjects, if there are any such, worthy of a divine revelation; and if we find competent proof that the Christian Scriptures contain such a revelation, it becomes us on those momentous topics to which it principally relates to adopt its instructions, without attempting to modify them by the suggestions of reason. The truths which they reveal to us are indeed *above* reason; but unless they contradict reason, it is presumptuous to gainsay them. When we assert the sufficiency of reason to guide us into all truth we deny the necessity of a revelation, which God forbid we should do.

From what has been said as to the mutual relations of reason and revelation, we derive the following practical rules: First, reason being infallible so far as its province extends, we should on no consideration adopt tenets contrary to reason; and second, on subjects above the cognizance of reason we should be ready to receive whatever doctrine Scripture fairly interpreted teaches, whether reason independently of revelation teaches it or not.

2. But would we profitably conduct our scriptural researches, something more is necessary than the mere recognition of these principles. We must disrobe ourselves of prejudice.

Personal, local, sectarian prejudice has done infinitely more to retard the progress of truth than misapprehensions on the subject already discussed. In fact it has occasioned such misapprehensions. The instructions of consciousness and experience as to the nature and province of reason, the dictates of reason as to the design of revelation, have all been set aside by prejudice. We are either educated in some system of doctrines which before we are able to judge for ourselves we are taught to regard as of divine authority; or else we derive our first religious impressions from some teacher ardently attached to a particular system, which we, by the instinct of gratitude or by some nameless impulse, are led to adopt and cherish as our own. When we begin to consult the volume of inspiration, we read, not to see what truth is actually revealed there, but to seek confirmation in the belief of doctrines which we are previously assured must

be found there. We consider as essential to the Christian system or scheme the doctrines which we have imbibed, wrest in their support every text of doubtful import, and too often apply the threats and denunciations against unbelievers to those who cannot interpret Scripture as we do. We sit down to the perusal of the gospel with a determination to find such and such doctrines upon its pages,—not with a humble resolution to receive whatever truth may there present itself. And in this case, whether the doctrines which we hold are true or false, they are mere prejudices, since we found them neither on impartial examination nor rational conviction.

Now this is the way in which the partisans of different sects confirm themselves in the belief of the tenets of those sects. Of course so many contradictory doctrines are not found in the Scriptures; but the imagination of every man arrays the oracles of divine truth in the dress which his prejudices would have them wear. Thus the Trinitarian sees a God, the Humanitarian a man, in every act of the suffering, dying, risen Saviour. The Universalist applies himself to the study of the Scriptures with a full belief that it is inconsistent with God's mercy to punish sin in another world, and the magic of this belief softens in his eye the harshest expressions of the divine displeasure, and strips the day of judgment of its terrors; while his no less prejudiced opponent sees vials of fiery indignation poured forth over those pages that beam with pure, unmingled love. The Episcopalian marks out nice distinctions of office in the apostolic church, and arrays its overseers in robes of episcopal authority; while the Presbyterian, in his zeal for equal rights among the clergy, snatches the mitre from the head upon which an apostle's hand had placed it. Would we derive truth from the Scriptures we must adopt the opposite course. We must apply ourselves to their study with childlike simplicity, with a sense of our ignorance, and of the inadequacy of human knowledge, and a willingness fearlessly to embrace its dictates, however much opposed to the prejudices which friendship, parental love, virtue, or piety may have hallowed.

A. P. Peabody.

The Coming of the Son of Man.

Mr. Editor,

In your number for March was a query on the text in Matt. xvi. 27, 28., "For the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels, and then he shall reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom." This passage has been a source of much doubt and perplexity to many sincere inquirers in every age, from the time of our Saviour down to the present. To the primitive disciples it seemed strongly to indicate the personal reäppearance of Jesus at no very distant day, and we accordingly find them in the midst of their persecutions and trials anxiously looking forward to this event as the consummation of their wishes, the fulfilment of their hopes. They united with this expectation that of the resurrection of the just and the commencement of the millennium, and they fondly anticipated that with their Master at their head they should reign together a thousand years in the new Jerusalem. The same expectation, notwithstanding the distinct declaration in the last part of the passage that the Son of Man would come before that generation had passed away,—notwithstanding this, the same expectation has been revived in successive ages; and in times not very remote from our own we have heard that the period of this mighty consummation was at hand, that the age of the millennium was approaching, that the Son of Man was about to make his appearance with power and great glory.

Now without inquiring into the origin of these ideas, I wish simply to remark that they have no foundation, as a matter of course, in the language before us,—that this is a prophecy the fulfilment of which is limited by its very terms to the age of the apostles, to the lifetime of some who heard the words from our Saviour's own lips. "Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom." The question naturally arises, What were the circumstances, what were the events in the apostolic age, which may be regarded as the accomplishment of this prophecy? for it is an obvious remark that the only safe and sound interpretation of language like this is to be found in the history which it was intended to

predict. To what, then, we inquire, did our Saviour probably have reference, and in what manner was the prophecy fulfilled?

The fact that our Saviour did not appear in person to take possession of the throne of Judea is sufficient, one would think, to establish the point that the language before us is not to be taken in its literal acceptation. It is proved by the event that it was not an outward and visible appearance to which he referred, that it was not an outward and visible throne that he intended to establish. It is well known, moreover, that, conformably to the previous conceptions of the Jews, the Christian dispensation is frequently represented in the New Testament under the figure of a kingdom. Adapting himself, as he did, to the poor and feeble conceptions of his countrymen, our Saviour frequently spoke of the influence of his religion in the human soul as the coming of the kingdom of God, as the establishing of the reign of the Messiah. On one occasion, we know, when he was inquired of by the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God should come, he answered them and said, "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation; neither shall ye say, Lo, here! or, Lo there! for behold the kingdom of God is within you." It is for these reasons we conclude that the language of the text is to be looked upon as figurative, that the subject of general reference is the establishment of Christianity in the world as a new and separate religion. In this view it is the language of strong encouragement to the little company of disciples, and of solemn warning to the rulers and people who were about to reject the Anointed of God. He tells them that although they were small and few in number, although they were at present despised and persecuted, although appearances were all against them, yet his cause and the cause of truth would assuredly triumph; that although they should forsake him in the hour of his trial and one should deny him and another should betray him, though he himself should be taken from them by cruel hands, yet he would come again in the spirit and power of his religion and restore them to himself. He would come again in the glory of his Father, through his appointed messengers; he would come with those principles which should convince the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment, and would requite to every man according to his deeds; he would come in his kingdom and take possession of his throne in the hearts and consciences of his sincere disciples. But when will he come? was the anxious inquiry;

When shall this be? Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here who shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of Man coming to reign, till they see these principles well established in the world.

From this view of the prophecy let us turn to the fulfilment. Before thirty years had elapsed from the time these words were uttered, while many of the first disciples and preachers of Christianity were living, we learn, upon the authority of profane as well as sacred historians, that Christianity had spread itself through Judea, Samaria, and Galilee, through almost all the numerous districts of Lesser Asia, through Greece and the islands of the Ægean Sea, along the sea-coast of Africa, and even to Rome and into the heart of Italy. In the single city of Jerusalem the number of Christians is estimated, at the least calculation, to be twenty thousand; at Corinth and at Athens the religion was embraced by some of the most distinguished individuals; and in Rome it had extended into the palace of the emperor. In ten years more we find Christianity in the most remote corners of the civilized world. It went forth with the strong confirmation of miraculous power, conquering and to conquer. In the short space of forty years from the time of the ascension, the church, which had assembled in an upper chamber in one of the streets of Jerusalem, had extended itself through all the avenues of the immense Roman empire. The vine which had sprung up in weakness, and which seemed liable at first to be cut off by the slightest attack, continued to gain deeper and deeper root, till it had shot forth its boughs to the sea and its branches to the river, till all the nations of the then known world had partaken of its fruit and reposed under its shade. This may be considered as the first great epoch in the establishment of Christianity, and this is comprehended in the lifetime of the apostles.

There is one event, especially, in the early history of the planting of Christianity, which, from its important bearing upon the success of the gospel, is more prominent than any other. It is frequently alluded to in this connexion by our Saviour himself and by many of the apostles. I refer to the destruction of the city and temple of Jerusalem. To the mind of a Jew no event could be more dreadful than that which was so distinctly foretold by our Saviour. To him it was indeed the end of the world, it involved the extinction of his national hopes, of his worldly prospects. When the temple fell, then fell the power and pomp of Judaism; when

the incense on the altar ceased to burn, when the holy of holies was trod by the unclean feet of the Roman soldiery, then was the ceremonial law extinguished. To the mind of a Christian in those days no event could be more interesting, as none was more important to the full establishment of his religion. We shall see the importance of this event more distinctly when we remember that so long as the city and temple stood firm the controversy still existed whether the Jews, who had long been the peculiar people of God, still continued to hold that relation. The destruction and dispersion of the nation had been foretold as their punishment. Until this was really inflicted, until the Jew was distinctly and visibly cut off from his former relation, the evidence of the truth of Christianity was not fully completed. Had that generation passed entirely away and the Jewish temples and altars remained standing, it would of course have been decided that Jesus had proved a false prophet, and the decision would have triumphed. In addition to this it may be remarked that in the apostolic times the Jews were almost the sole persecutors of the Christians. Wherever the apostles went the Jews were always the foremost in exciting against them the anger of the populace. From this it is evident that the downfall of Judaism was rendered absolutely necessary to the full and entire establishment of Christianity. Until that took place the question in controversy was not settled, the evidence was not completed, the prophecy was not fulfilled, the rod of Jewish persecution was not broken.

Now the destruction of the Jews is foretold in language closely resembling the passage before us. We cannot doubt that the same general subject is referred to, that the same events were in the mind of our Saviour in both cases. In fact the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth chapters of Matthew are in answer to the question, "What shall be the sign of thy coming and of the end of the world?" The answer is, When the forms of Judaism shall be destroyed, when the desolating abomination that is spoken of by Daniel, — the Roman army with its ensigns and eagles, — shall stand upon the holy soil, when this beautiful temple with its fair proportions shall be levelled with the ground, when the sun shall be darkened and the moon shall not give her light, when, in fact, the principles of true religion shall be deeply rooted in the hearts of my disciples, then will the sign of the Son of Man appear, then will commence the reign of the Messiah, then will the kingdom of heaven be begun. It is for these reasons, among

others, that the destruction of the Jewish city and temple is so intimately blended as we find it in our Bibles with the coming of the Son of Man. It was his coming in the spirit and power of his religion, — it was his coming in his kingdom and in the glory of his Father, — it was coming in his capacity of Judge of the world, to requite to every man according to his deeds, to execute judgment upon a nation that had abused their privileges and rejected the offers of love and mercy. In the history that has come down to us of the Jewish war, the long and painful siege which the city underwent, the distress of its inhabitants, and its final and complete overthrow, — in these the prophecy before us, so far as it respected this particular event, was exactly and literally fulfilled.

I have thus shown that the obvious and primary reference of the passage, the reference which our Saviour intended, was to that establishment of his religion in the hearts of men which took place in the lifetime of the apostles. The remainder of the inquiry I will notice in your next number.

Yours,

H. B. Goodwin.

Manufactures in their Influence upon Pauperism.

No. I.

SMALL MANUFACTURING ESTABLISHMENTS.

A few general remarks should be premised. There is a great difference between manufactures which provide the necessaries and those which provide the luxuries of life. The demand for luxuries depends upon the whim and caprice of fashion. Those employed in such manufactures are therefore exposed to extreme and ruinous fluctuations. To be sure, more than the actual cost is usually paid for the fripperies of fashion; but as a matter of fact, — and it is a fact which reason might lead us to suspect, — no class of labourers are so meanly paid as those who are engaged in administering to the factitious wants of the fashionable world, and no class is exposed to such distress from want of employment. Instead, therefore, of looking with a childish envy upon nations which furnish us with finery, we should with all due humility congratulate ourselves that we have something better to do;

that among us men of all orders rest their hopes of support upon something more substantial than the filmy gossamer, which is blown about by the breeze of fashion. We should discourage this species of manufacture, and be content to receive supplies from abroad, however severely those who set their hearts upon such things may suffer by being deprived of a particular kind of ribbon or lace, in consequence of the uncertainty of a foreign market.

Another general remark that we would make is, that though it should be proved that the manufacture of necessary things does in some slight degree contribute to pauperism,—that is, though it should appear that those employed in this sort of manufacture are more subject to the evils of pauperism than other classes of labourers,—it by no means follows that manufactures are injurious to the community, or even to the poor themselves. For we cannot be independent without them. If all manufactured articles came from abroad, a war or any other casualty which should cut off the supply would expose us to great distress; and as the poor and those bordering upon the regions of poverty are always the first to suffer in any pressure of this kind, there can be no doubt that they would thus be exposed to a severity of suffering which they are not called to undergo by any little and gradual increase of poverty that manufactures may cause. Though the operatives themselves should suffer more than other classes now do, it must not be forgotten that their labours contribute in no small measure to the ease and comfort of all other classes of society; and that without their labours their own condition, in common with that of all others, might be even lower than it now is.

With these introductory remarks we would state it as our opinion that small manufacturing establishments scattered through the country, though liable to some considerable evils, are yet a great preventive of poverty.

A well cultivated country is able to support at least twice as many inhabitants as can be profitably employed in tillage. If a large proportion of those not employed in agriculture are engaged in manufactures, they are contributing to the comfort of those who work upon the soil, and in return receive their food and the raw materials for manufacture. The two classes mutually benefit each other. But if, on the other hand, only a few are manufacturers, there will, at least in inland places, be a surplus of agricultural labour; its price will of course be below its proper level, and few besides freeholders will be in

a comfortable situation. A great proportion of the mere labourers will have no means of earning an adequate support, and the poverty must be oppressive.

We would not, however, rest the doctrine upon reasoning so general. Anyone acquainted with country towns wholly agricultural must know that many of the inhabitants, during parts of the year, can find no profitable employment; and also that there will be many whose labour can at no time be turned to account. Widows, or women with shiftless or intemperate husbands, may have large families of girls and young children, whose united exertions in a merely farming district cannot procure a comfortable living; and they may be obliged, however great their reluctance, and however willing to work they may be, to be occasionally assisted either by the hand of private charity or by the public bounty. But if there chance to spring up a small manufacturing establishment in their neighbourhood, a place is at once afforded where they find employment. We need no further proof of this than the advance in the price of female labour among us within the last fifteen years. Many are the families in which the helpless young and the equally helpless old are comfortably supported by the labours of those between the ages of childhood and maturity. And all this is done without many of the evils which are attendant upon overgrown manufacturing towns. The simplicity of rural life is not destroyed; the healthiness of a country situation is preserved; comfortable habitations may be provided; and the strong ties of kindred, which make home a place of instruction and delight, the abode of peace, the nursery of pure affections and holy feelings, are kept unbroken.

But the advantage stops not here. Farmers are provided with a ready market for their produce, and the expense of distant transportation is avoided. Each town is thus rendered in a great degree independent. Besides, no considerable manufacture can be carried on without scientific knowledge. The superintendents must be scientific men. But men of science stationed in our villages must do something to diffuse knowledge, to raise the intellectual character of the people, and thus indirectly prevent pauperism. This, however, from a variety of counteracting causes, is but a small thing.

J. H. Morison.

Letters to Unbelievers.

No. IV.

RELIGIOUS OPINIONS OF THOMAS JEFFERSON.

FELLOW-CITIZENS,

I concluded my last letter with the assertion that I never knew a man, that I never heard of a man, that I never read of a man, who had examined the evidences of natural and revealed religion with honesty and candour and patience, who remained an unbeliever. I am therefore naturally led to notice the belief of those distinguished men of our country whom you claim as infidels; and I am bound to show, either that they were Christians, or that they were ignorant of the foundation on which Christianity securely rests. The following quotation from the Lectures of Frances Wright will disclose the names of some eminent individuals whom you are exceedingly anxious to enrol on the list of infidelity; —

"Would not the American people do better to seek the opinions of their great men in their own works and those of their confidential cotemporaries, than in the trash of the tract-house and the libels of the pulpit? Would they not do well to understand, before they take the alarm at the senseless cry of *infidel*, that Washington, that Jefferson, that Franklin, that John Adams, that Ethan Allen, that Horatio Gates, and ALL the nobler host of worthies who secured this country's independence, were *all*, according to the priestly acceptation of a meaningless word, *infidels*; that is, *all* disbelieved the compound Jewish and Christian system, and looked upon its mysteries and its miracles as upon nursery tales?" — *Lectures*, p. 13.

In the present communication I wish to invite your attention to the religious opinions of THOMAS JEFFERSON. I shall prove, from his own writings and from a letter from his granddaughter, *that he called himself a Christian, and wished to be so considered by his fellow-men; that he disclaimed the name of unbeliever, and desired that his reputation might never be blackened by the epithet of infidel.*

1. Did Mr. Jefferson disclaim infidelity and call himself a

Christian? Read the following extract from a letter to the celebrated Dr. Rush:—

"In some of the delightful conversations with you, in the evenings of 1798-99, and which served as an anodyne to the afflictions of the crisis through which our country was then labouring, the Christian religion was sometimes our topic; and I then promised you that, one day or other, I would give you my views of it. They are the result of a life of inquiry and reflection, and very different from that anti-Christian system imputed to me by those who know nothing of my opinions. To the corruptions of Christianity I am indeed opposed; but not to the genuine precepts of Jesus himself. *I am a Christian, in the only sense in which he wished anyone to be;* sincerely attached to his doctrines, in preference to all others; ascribing to himself every human excellence, and believing he never claimed any other."—*Works*, Vol. III. p. 506.

What do you make of this testimony? Does he not affirm that his views of the gospel are very different from that anti-Christian or infidel system sometimes imputed to him by those ignorant of his religious opinions? Does he not unequivocally declare himself a Christian believer? Does he not ascribe to Jesus human perfection, *every* human excellence? How can you dispose of such explicit statements? Will unbelievers now assent to these declarations? No. Let them no longer, then, claim a person whose very words pronounce their condemnation.

2. What views did Mr. Jefferson entertain concerning Jesus and his religion? Read the following extracts from his published letters:—

"In this state of things among the Jews, Jesus appeared. His parentage was obscure; his condition poor; his education null; his natural endowments great; his life correct and innocent; he was meek, benevolent, patient, firm, disinterested, and of the sublimest eloquence."

"He corrected the deism of the Jews, confirming them in their belief of one only God, and giving them juster notions of his attributes and government. His moral doctrines, relating to kindred and friends, were more pure and perfect than those of the most correct of the philosophers, and greatly more so than those of the Jews; and they went far beyond both in inculcating universal philanthropy, not only to kindred and friends, to neighbours and countrymen, but to all mankind, gathering all into one family, under the bonds of love, charity, peace, common wants, and common aids."

"The precepts of philosophy and of the Hebrew code laid hold of actions only. He pushed his scrutinies into the heart of man, erected his tribunal in the region of his thoughts, and purified the waters at the fountain-head. He taught emphatically the doctrine of a future state, which was either doubted or disbelieved by the Jews; and wielded it with efficacy as an important incentive, supplementary to the other motives to moral conduct." — *Works*, Vol. III. pp. 508-9.

"This free exercise of reason is all I ask for the vindication of the character of Jesus. We find in the writings of his biographers, ... sublime ideas of the Supreme Being, aphorisms and precepts of the purest morality and benevolence sanctioned by a life of humility, innocence, and simplicity of manners, neglect of riches, absence of worldly ambition and honours, with an eloquence and persuasiveness which have not been surpassed. These could not be the inventions of the grovelling authors who relate them. They are far beyond the powers of their feeble minds. They show that there was a character, the subject of their history, whose splendid conceptions were above all suspicion of being interpolations from their hands." — *Works*, Vol. IV. p. 326.

"It is the innocence of his character, the purity and sublimity of his moral precepts, the eloquence of his inculcations, the beauty of the apologues in which he conveys them, that I so much admire; sometimes, indeed, needing indulgence to eastern hyperbolism." — *Works*, Vol. IV. p. 321.

Do your writers speak in this manner concerning Christ and his gospel? I have lately read not a little of the writings of modern unbelievers, and I have found nothing respecting Jesus and his religion but condemnation. Why, then, will you persist in claiming a man whose very words contradict your constant assertions? But a few more passages shall finish this division.

"The doctrines of Jesus are simple, and tend all to the happiness of man. 1. That there is one only God, and he all-perfect. 2. That there is a future state of rewards and punishments. 3. That to love God with all thy heart and thy neighbour as thyself is the sum of religion. These are the great points on which he endeavoured to reform the religion of the Jews..... Had the doctrines of Jesus been preached always as pure as they came from his lips, the whole civilized world would now have been Christian. — *Works*, Vol. IV. p. 349.

"The Christian religion, when divested of the rags in which they have enveloped it, and brought to the original purity and simplicity of its benevolent institutor, is a religion of all others

most friendly to liberty, science, and the freest expansion of the human mind." — *Works*, Vol. III. p. 463.

"If the moral precepts innate in man, and made a part of his physical constitution as necessary for a social being, if the sublime doctrines of philanthropism and deism taught us by Jesus of Nazareth, in which all agree, constitute true religion, then without it, this would be, as you again say, 'something not fit to be named, even indeed a hell.'" — *Works*, Vol. IV. p. 301.

I could quote many more passages of a similar description; but these must be sufficient to satisfy the most skeptical that the writer never belonged to your party. You must perceive the injustice of claiming one as an unbeliever who could conscientiously utter such sentiments respecting Jesus and his religion. You must admit that your female leader has discovered no small share of ignorance or dishonesty in her bold and unsupported assertions.

3. Did Mr. Jefferson rejoice in the spread of Christianity? Did he desire to have any one denomination prevail? Or did he wish, like your writers, to banish the gospel from the face of the earth? Read the following extracts, and then decide these inquiries for yourselves: —

"I rejoice that in this blessed country of free inquiry and belief, which has surrendered its creed and conscience to neither kings nor priests, the genuine doctrine of one only God is reviving; and I trust that there is not a young man now living in the United States who will not die an Unitarian." — *Works*, Vol. IV. pp. 349-50.

"Happy in the prospect of a restoration of primitive Christianity, I must leave to younger athletes to encounter and lop off the false branches which have been engrafted into it by the mythologists of the middle and modern ages. I am not aware of the peculiar resistance to Unitarianism which you ascribe to Pennsylvania..... This doctrine has not yet been preached to us; but the breeze begins to be felt which precedes the storm; and fanaticism is all in a bustle, shutting its doors and windows to keep it out. But it will come, and drive before it the foggy mists of Platonism which have so long obscured our atmosphere. I am in hopes some of the disciples of your institution [Harvard University] will become missionaries to us of these doctrines truly evangelical, and open our eyes to what has been so long hidden from them. A bold and eloquent preacher would be nowhere listened to with more freedom than in this state, nor with more firmness of mind..... He might be excluded by our hierophants from their churches and meeting-houses, but would be attended in the fields by whole acres of hearers and think-

ers. Missionaries from Cambridge would soon be greeted with more welcome than from the tritheistical school of Andover. Such are my wishes, such would be my welcomes, warm and cordial as the assurances of my esteem and respect for you." — *Works*, Vol. IV. p. 354.

"I have to thank you for your pamphlets on the subject of Unitarianism, and to express my gratification with your efforts for the revival of primitive Christianity in your quarter..... And a strong proof of the solidity of the primitive faith is its restoration, as soon as a nation arises which vindicates to itself the freedom of religious opinion and its external divorce from the civil authority. The pure and simple unity of the Creator of the universe is now all but ascendant in the Eastern States; it is dawning in the West, and advancing towards the South; and I confidently expect that the present generation will see Unitarianism become the general religion of the United States. The Eastern presses are giving us many excellent pieces on the subject, and Priestley's learned writings on it are or should be in every hand." — *Works*, Vol. IV. p. 360.

Many more passages of a similar import might be quoted did my object require them or my limits permit their introduction. Is this the language of an unbeliever? Are these the words of an infidel? Are these the wishes and desires of an anti-Christian? Let your own publications answer. Let the infinite difference of your views and those expressed above cause your silence in future respecting this distinguished patriot.

4. Did Mr. Jefferson feel hurt at the imputation of infidelity? Did he speak of infidels as a class with which he had no connexion? Did he accuse them of rejecting the gospel without proper inquiry? For an answer to these questions, you may read the following extracts: —

"I promised you that, one day or other, I would give you my views of the Christian religion. They are very different from that *anti-Christian* system imputed to me by those who know nothing of my opinions." — *Works*, Vol. III. p. 506.

"They [the Orthodox clergy] wish it to be believed that he can have no religion who advocates its freedom." — *Works*, Vol. IV. p. 194.

"They [the doctrines of Jesus] have been still more disfigured by the corruptions of schismatizing followers, who have found an interest in sophisticating and perverting the simple doctrines he taught, by engrafting on them the mysticisms of a Grecian sophist, frittering them into subtilties, and obscuring them with jargon, *until they have caused good men to reject the whole in dis-*

gust, and to view Jesus himself as an impostor." — *Works*, Vol. III. pp. 508-9.

"Their blasphemies have *driven thinking men into infidelity*, who have *too hastily rejected* the supposed author himself, with the horrors so falsely imputed to him." — *Works*, Vol. IV. p. 349.

"If histories so unlike as those of Hercules and Jesus can by a fertile imagination and allegorical interpretations be brought to the same tally, no line of distinction remains between fact and fancy." — *Works*, Vol. IV. pp. 296-7.

And what is the meaning of all these remarks? Was the writer an anti-Christian, when he disclaimed the imputation of infidelity? Was he one of the good men who had rejected the gospel in disgust on account of the absurdities of some believers? Was he one of the number who had been driven into infidelity, and too hastily rejected the Christian religion, on account of the cruel doctrines of Calvinism? I suppose by this time you must be fully convinced that my position is proved. Under each of the divisions I could have greatly enlarged. I am sorry to be obliged to omit more than three quarters of the extracts I have made from his works with a special reference to this controversy; but the length of my article warns me to conclude with the still more convincing testimony which yet remains.

5. Finally, then, I present you, in proof of my position, a letter which I have received from a granddaughter of Mr. Jefferson. If any person can know the truth on this question, it is this lady. For she was the constant companion of her grandfather for a considerable period, and from childhood enjoyed, to a remarkable degree, his affection and confidence.

———, *January* 27, 1834.

SIR,

Your letter of the 23d of January was this morning received, and I hasten to reply to it, willing to give all the information I can on a subject of so much personal interest to myself, but compelled, for many reasons, to request that, whatever use you make of the few details I have it in my power to furnish, my own name may be kept out of sight. I apprehend, however, I can add but little to the information you already possess on the subject of Mr. Jefferson's religious opinions, which, judging from the spirit of your letter, is both copious and correct. Your plan of making him speak for himself is unquestionably the best that can be pursued; nor do I conceive it possible for anyone,

after an impartial perusal of his published works, to persist in applying to him the name of infidel; a name which for himself he ever disclaimed. Still, his letters on religious subjects are scattered through the body of his correspondence, and much additional light may be thrown on the nature of his opinions by their being brought together, arranged, and condensed, in the able manner in which I have no doubt they will be in the work you are about to publish.

I regret that I can say but little of his last moments, as I was, unhappily for myself, absent from his dying bed. But I have it on the testimony of others, that he died as he had lived, a Christian philosopher. He was perfectly aware of the approach of death, and his last days were marked by a serenity most perfect. His thoughts were undisturbed by self-reproach, fear, or regret. His life had been long and most purely virtuous. In the latter part of it, however, his bodily sufferings had been great, and although he had borne them with exemplary patience he could not but feel that death came as a friend to release him from the burden of years and infirmities. He felt, too, that his work was done; and even amid those wanderings of the mind which precede dissolution and indicate that the soul is already poising her wings for flight, the words, "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace," were among the last that he uttered. He had previously given his parting admonitions to the younger members of the family; whilst on each individual of the sorrowing friends who surrounded him he had bestowed some expression of comfort or tenderness. He died a Christian; for although his views of the mission of Jesus were to a certain degree peculiar and different from those of others, yet he thought them the true ones, and claimed for himself the name of a follower of Christ. He always said he was a Christian, in what he understood to be the true sense of the word, and according to the doctrines which he believed were truly those of Jesus.

Mr. Jefferson's character, in spite of the mistakes which prevail among many persons in regard to it, was essentially Christian, and could have been formed under no other influences than those of the gospel. He was, if ever man was, merciful, pure in heart, a peace-maker, one who forgave his enemies not seven times but seventy times seven, doing his alms in secret, and praying, not at the corners of the streets, but in the retirement of his closet; and his heavenly Father, who heard him in secret, will perhaps one day reward him openly, when he shall receive from men the justice due to his true character and principles.

Mr. Jefferson's religious opinions have been variously represented, and almost always misrepresented. What I now assert I do on the authority of his own words and actions, heard and witnessed by myself. He entertained the greatest possible ad-

miration and veneration for the character and doctrines of Jesus, and few persons devote more time than he did to the reading and study of the New Testament. He had carefully prepared for his own use an abstract of the life and sayings of Jesus, extracting from the writings of the Evangelists such chapters or parts of chapters as appeared to him of the greatest power and beauty, and arranging them so as to form a continuous narrative; but a copy of the New Testament as it stands was always within reach of the chair which he usually occupied when he wrote or read. He frequently had recourse to it in his moments of retirement, and never more than when under the pressure of sorrow he sought the rest which is offered to the heavy laden. Upon one occasion, having experienced an affliction of the severest kind, he was found by the person who first ventured to interrupt the retirement of his grief, with the sacred volume in his hands; and in this he continued to read, at intervals, the whole time during which the agony of his feelings absorbed all thoughts but those which even then he could give to the words of the Saviour.

Nor was his love for the Scriptures entirely confined to the writings of the Evangelists. Although he never appeared to take the same pleasure in reading the Old Testament, yet there were parts which he greatly admired; many of the Psalms of David especially. Several of them I have heard him repeat from beginning to end, such as the twenty-third, "The Lord is my shepherd"; and the fifteenth, the metrical version of which,

> "Lord, who 's the happy man that may
> To thy blest courts repair?"

I have seen copied out in his own hand more than once. He was also in the habit of writing down such occasional hymns as pleased and satisfied him, and I have one or two written on small scraps of paper which I carefully preserve.

It may be worth while to mention, in passing, that his voice and manner were particularly impressive when he read aloud, as he sometimes did, passages from the New Testament, or repeated the Psalms of David. There was a feeling and an earnestness in his tones which added much to the effect of what he read. Of sacred music he was particularly fond, and especially of the old psalm-tunes, which he regretted much to find giving way in favour of more modern compositions. His voice continued sweet and unbroken to the last years of his life, and I have frequently heard him singing passages of the old psalms.

He was as regular an attendant at church as circumstances permitted, and frequently overcame obstacles of roads and weather which might have deterred younger and more vigorous men. He preferred the liturgy of the church of England to any other form of worship, and always kept by him an Episcopalian prayer-book.

Such indications as these are the more worthy of notice, because Mr. Jefferson is well known to have been a fearless and uncompromising man, paying small respect either to persons or what he considered prejudices. His worst enemies have never, I believe, charged him with hypocrisy, and his assertion of independence both in speech and action has often caused him to be misunderstood and misrepresented.

He was particularly sturdy on the subject of his religious belief, viewing with peculiar abhorrence all attempts to establish anything like an inquisition over the free thoughts of the mind, particularly on subjects which, far beyond human jurisdiction, lie between man and his God, to whom only he should be required to render his account. But to friendly inquiry and even admonition Mr. Jefferson was always open and gentle, and I have been pleased and surprised to see what different impressions from those which they brought good religious persons would often carry away, after long and frank converse with him on topics of which he equally with themselves admitted the importance, although perhaps his particular views might be different from their own.

With regard to Mr. Jefferson's belief in a future state, he has himself expressly declared it in more than one of his writings; but it is also a fact that the last words ever traced by his hands were an expression of the hope and expectation of rejoining the wife of his youth, whom he had never ceased to regret, and a daughter whose untimely death had robbed him of one staff of his old age, although he was blest with a surviving daughter whose devoted affection to himself he repaid by the most unbounded attachment.

Such, sir, are the best answers I can give to your questions addressed to me on the subject of my dear grandfather's opinions. But after all, the best answer to the accusations of his open enemies, and the more dangerous assertions of his pretended friends, is to be found in the whole tenour of a life passed in the exercise of every Christian virtue and devoted to the service of his fellow-men. A distinction which he liked to draw between the lessons of heathen philosophy and those of Jesus was, that the former had for their object to teach man to take care of his own happiness, whilst the latter turned his thoughts to the happiness of others. And if all were not happy who came within the sphere of Mr. Jefferson's influence, it was not for want of the most constant efforts on his part to make them so. In small things as in great the same ardent desire to do good formed the spring of all his actions. His kind offices beginning at home extended themselves in circles until they reached the utmost limits of his powers. At home he had been the best husband, and was the best father and grandfather, the kindest master, the most faithful and active friend, the most useful

neighbour. He was loved best always where best known. Those who approached him nearest were the most devoted in their affection and veneration, and it was only as men receded from him that they lost sight of his true proportions, which thus became distorted through the mists of prejudice and lost the symmetry which really belonged to them. I repeat again my firm belief that such a character as Mr. Jefferson's could have been formed under no other influences than those of the gospel; that there is in this world but one sort of tree capable of bearing such fruit.

I make no apology for these encomiums on so near a relation. Mr. Jefferson has ceased to belong exclusively to his family. He belongs to mankind, and we of his blood should consider ourselves as holding such information as our situation in regard to him enabled us to become possessed of in trust for those who ask it of us, and who, we believe, will make a worthy use of it. We speak as of one whom we love more than others can do, simply because we have known him better. Whatever light, therefore, this letter can throw upon the truth, as it regards a good and great man, is yours, sir, to make such use of as seems best to you; reserving only, as my own privilege, the right which belongs to every female, of avoiding public notice.

With sentiments of great respect,
I remain yours, &c.

Now, unbelievers, what will you do with all this mass of evidence? You cannot assert, with the least shadow of truth, that Mr. Jefferson ever uttered or published a syllable which contradicts a single sentiment I have quoted. No. All these opinions he did cordially embrace. All this is positive proof which cannot be refuted. But you can affirm that he has written some things which other Christians reject, and that he has spoken plainly concerning some parts of the Scriptures, Calvinism, the Orthodox clergy, and the apostles. All this I admit; but what does this prove? Because I have expressed my honest views respecting human systems of divinity, ambitious priests, or some things recorded in the Bible, am I therefore to be classed among unbelievers? This is surely a new mode of reasoning for infidels; and I will not charge this absurdity upon your system, until I find it stated in your publications.

You may also contend that Christians of different sects have called Mr. Jefferson an unbeliever. This I acknowledge; but what does this prove? Are you in the habit of taking the assertions of Orthodox believers in proof of any position which you reject? Why should you in this instance?

On what ground have they preferred this charge against him? Simply because he did not believe so much concerning Jesus and his religion as they did. Is this treating him according to gospel rules? Is this conduct consistent with the fundamental principles of Protestantism? I freely grant that my belief on several points of Christianity differs essentially from that of Mr. Jefferson. I do not know as he would agree in all particulars with any denomination in Christendom. But what of all this? Is not the Bible the common standard of divine truth? Has he not as much right to investigate as any other individual? Must I condemn one neighbour for believing too much and another for not believing enough? Am I the infallible pope? From whom have I received any such commission? No. I am bound by the gospel to do unto others as I would have others do unto me. I have no willingness to be called an infidel because I cannot assent to the creed of my Orthodox friend; neither have I any disposition to condemn Mr. Jefferson because he could not receive all the articles of my faith, so long as I know he wished to be regarded a follower of Jesus.

But the wrong-doing of Christians is no excuse for your misconduct. You profess to be governed by the principles of common honesty, I suppose. Now I demand to know upon what authority you claim Mr. Jefferson as an infidel. You have seen that he called himself a Christian, and wished to be so regarded by his fellow-men. You have seen that he endeavoured to regulate his life by the precepts of Jesus, and died in expectation of admission to the heaven which he revealed. You have seen that his family regard this charge of infidelity as a gross and shameless slander upon the character of their venerated relative. Can you consider your course honest, fair, just, right? I appeal to your common sense. I appeal to the community. Wherever this distinguished man is to be classed, he evidently does not belong to your party. I have no further interest in the question than to have the truth prevail, and if this be your object, as you loudly profess, you will no longer claim Thomas Jefferson as an infidel.

B. Whitman.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Social Evils and their Remedy. The Mechanic. By the Rev. CHARLES B. TAYLOR. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1834. 18mo. pp. 159.

THAT the Messrs. Harper should give to the public an American edition of this work is nothing strange; but that a clergyman should be its author is more than we can account for, without a supposition which we are unwilling to make. The clergyman who really understands and is prepared to fill his mission is the workingman's true friend. The gospel is emphatically the workingman's religion. They were "the common people who heard Jesus gladly"; and it was because "the poor had the gospel preached unto them" that John was instructed to infer that the Messiah had come. By "preaching the gospel to the poor," we are not to suppose was merely meant proclaiming to them its great truths, but that the gospel which contemplated the moral and social elevation of the poor, of the lower classes, was there proclaimed. This the gospel did contemplate, and insured it when it proclaimed the fraternity of the human race; and it is this which makes it a religion for the many, peculiarly good news to the millions.

The author of the book before us gives us no evidence that he has ever suspected this. He seems not to be aware that by virtue of his office he is bound to be the poor man's friend and the unshrinking advocate of the equal rights of all men. He sees a broad line of distinction between the higher and the lower classes of society, but he sees no evil in it. He sees evil only in the uneasiness of the lower class, in its efforts to equal or to exchange places with the higher. This book, coming as it does from a clergyman, would, if anything could, justify infidelity, and render indifference to religion a virtue. It breathes a spirit that would crush every effort of the people to meliorate their social condition. Its sentiments are worthy none but an antediluvian politician, such as none but a slave can embrace, or a tyrant wish to propagate. Its language is, "Vulgar Mechanics, to your places. Stand ready bitted and saddled for your masters' pleasure. Be brutes, as you are, and dream not that you are human beings." Such is the lesson with which it would cure social evils, and such the lesson its publishers would read to the liberty-loving workingmen of America!

With these remarks we dismiss this little production, but not the subject it professes to discuss. That subject is one not to be lightly dismissed by him who is conscious that there are duties which he owes to his fellow-beings. We fear, however, that too many do lightly dismiss it. We fear there are those who would brand such as believe that there are great and grievous social evils which demand redress, as agitators, demagogues, jacobins, or persons of desperate fortunes, who have nothing to lose but everything to gain by a change. We fear there are those, and even clergymen too, who, with their faces turned to the past, have no inward visions of a greater good for the human race, who dream not that as the professed disciples of Jesus they are bound to desire a progress, and to labour to set their fellow-beings forward in knowledge and virtue. We fear there are those who, because they find this world "a vale of tears" to the many, confounding the actual with the possible, infer that it always must be so, that God decreed it, and that it is impious not to be resigned to it. We fear; God grant that we fear without reason! We wish not to complain. But we would to God that all, and especially every clergyman, felt that the gospel was given to effect a great moral and social reform in man's earthly condition, that Jesus was a reformer, that the apostles were reformers, that he and they suffered martyrdom as reformers, and that whoever would be a true disciple of Jesus must love all men, even the most abandoned, well enough, if need be, to die as he did, upon the cross for their salvation; that everyone felt that he owes a vast debt to the community — a debt which cannot be paid so long as a single human being is deprived of his rights, a single vice remains to be corrected, a single new truth to be promulgated, or the least additional good to be obtained for any portion of our fellow-beings. We should feel this. It should sink deep into our hearts, and forbid us to desist from an earnest inquiry after a remedy for all social evils of whatever name or magnitude.

We say *remedy*. For we are not of that number who believe the evils of the social state are irremediable. We are not of that number who believe the earth is smitten with the malediction of Heaven, and that groans and tears are man's inevitable lot. We have seen suffering, we have heard complaints, we have seen and shared in man's miseries; but we never dared believe their cause was lodged in the bosom of the Divinity. We have seen the hand of God at work in the affairs of men; but we have seen it at work only for good. We have seen it pouring "oil and wine" into the wounded heart, binding up the broken spirit, and making the sufferer whole; but we have not seen it pushing man forward in a career of madness and compelling him to be "the greatest plague and tormentor of his kind." We have seen the factitious distinctions of society, and the tremendous evils they

involve, but we have seen in them no marks of the wisdom and goodness of God; we have seen in them only the foolishness and wickedness of man. "The foolishness of man perverteth his way, and his heart fretteth against the Lord." If these evils are the work of man they are not imperishable. If man has made them, man can unmake them. At least, it can be no disrespect to the Deity to labour to remove them.

But what is the remedy for our social evils? Who is able to answer? Not he who, contemning first principles and what he calls abstract science, applauds himself for being only a *practical* man; not he who denies all disinterestedness, and judging from his own heart, pronounces selfishness the governing principle of everyone's life; not he who is unconscious of the great duties involved in the spiritual brotherhood of the human race; not he who has to learn that his nature is allied to the Divinity and is susceptible of indefinite perfectibility; nor he who sees in the gospel no great social principle, which in its progressive developement must not only modify but recast society and place it upon an entirely new base. The remedy is in Christianity — in Christianity, not as a dogma, not as a system of belief, but as a grand, all-comprehending principle of moral and social action. It can be found only by carrying out into all the details of social and private life those great moral maxims which Jesus disclosed in his teaching and exemplified in his life. But how is this to be done? Not by saying, as it is said on either hand, It cannot be done; but by a full confidence that it can and *must* be done, and by engaging in earnest to do it. The pulpit alone cannot do it. *That* has spoken. Its voice, we trust, has alarmed many a one's conscience, arrested many a sinner in his mad career, called back many of the erring, and often consoled and confirmed the good; but alone it is too weak to check and roll back the full tide of depravity. It must be aided by Education.

Education! He who pronounces that word pronounces the remedy for the evils of man's social condition. But not he who speaks only of intellectual education. Many know their duty, but do it not. Many a man's understanding is right whose feelings are wrong. Man's *whole* nature must be educated. *Educated*, we say; by which we mean the right exercise, training, or disciplining of man's whole physical, intellectual, and moral nature. The body must be so educated as to insure it health, active and vigorous limbs; the feelings should be so disciplined that those which furnish the energy for useful and virtuous action may always be predominant; and the intellect should be so developed that the right and the best means of obtaining it shall always be obvious.

Education should have a religious foundation. Those who propose a system of education which excludes religion propose nothing really practicable or desirable. Aside from that part of

man's nature which finds its sphere of activity only in what pertains to religion, man is but an animal, or a mere creature of barren logic. In either case he ceases to be a human being who adds to his animal propensities and his reasoning powers those moral instincts which are the distinguishing characteristics and which constitute the real glory of human nature. All that is generous, touching, or sublime in our nature is intimately allied to the religious sentiment, and withers and disappears whenever that is struck with death. We would have all our systems of education recognise this truth. The great object of all our schools should be to reveal the mind to itself, to make the soul conscious of its lofty and deathless energies, and of its power to grow by an ever-enlarging virtue into the likeness of the Divinity. But in making religion the base of education, we should detach it from its various forms, disengage it from all its sectarian connexions, and present it simply as a sentiment of the heart, a law of the soul, as the great principle which is forever urging man forward towards higher and more advanced states of living. In school we would consider it as the principle of perfectibility, and occupy the young mind only with its spirit and results.

We know there are those who would exclude religion from our schools; but we believe it is only because they identify it with dogmas, and its instruction with sectarian strife and animosity. Did they view it as we do, they could not object to it. It does seem to us that no one not in love with depravity, no one who ever stops to gaze on an opening flower, to inhale its sweet perfume, or to catch the wild note of a forest songster, no one who feels the least emotion on beholding the distant mountains with harmonious outlines, the ocean where its "waves sleep on its bosom," or when the storm lashes them into fury, the deep blue vault of heaven lighted up with its thousands of evening fires, a generous sentiment, an act of heroism or of disinterested affection, can object to religion, which, as we view it, and as we would have it introduced into schools, is but the right exercise of our highest and most glorious faculties — neither more nor less than the perception of the beautiful and true, sympathy with the pure and spiritual, veneration for the holy, love for the good, gratitude for the munificent and the kind, and an eternal up-shooting of the soul towards perfection.

But however thorough, however religious, education may be made, the education of a few will not be enough. Egypt was the cradle of learning, of arts and sciences; but she has fallen. Greece was once the academy of the civilized world. Her philosophers sounded the depths of the human mind. Her poets and orators stand unrivalled. Her artists seized upon the idea of the beautiful, detached it, reëmbodied it, in forms which remain and will remain models through all coming time. But

Greece has fallen. Rome, once the haughty mistress of the world, was rich in statesmen, heroes, learned men, poets, and orators. But she has fallen, and comparative solitude reigns upon the "Seven hills" of her greatness. Why have all these fallen and veiled their glory in the dust? Not for the want of the educated few, but of the many—*for the want of an educated, enlightened population.* The lights which shot from the educated few were but flashes soon lost in the profound darkness which enveloped the mass of the people. The education of a few is not enough. The millions must be sent to school—not merely sent to school for two or three months in a year for half a dozen years, but must be educated in the fullest, broadest sense of the term. The whole population of a country and eventually of the world must be educated. This is the remedy for social evils,—education, moral, intellectual, and physical, based on religion, and universally diffused, and this, too, is a remedy which can be applied.

Can be applied. The stationary philosophers may contradict us. They may allege such a thing never has been, therefore never can be; that children are born with unequal capacities, and that it is folly to dream of making all equal; but they will not move us. We admit that children are born with different capacities, that education can never make all equal, but it does not follow from this that all cannot be educated. Education cannot create; we admit it can only unfold and aid the growth of the germs which nature originally wishes, but all except idiots have the genius and are susceptible of a spiritual as well as a physical growth. That all can reach the same size we do not pretend; but that all with proper culture can grow, will grow, is a truth we presume no one will controvert. Let this culture be given to all, let all have the means of attaining the largest growth of which they are susceptible; we ask no more.

To infer that all cannot be educated because all have not been is a species of logic long since superannuated. It is too late in the day to measure the future by the past. He who should wish to do it would have sided with the judges that condemned Socrates to drink the hemlock, would have joined the cry of the multitude in reference to Jesus, "Crucify him, Crucify him"; he would have recommended the burning of Huss and Jerome and Bruno, and the incarceration of Galileo; ridiculed Columbus for his new geographical notions, laughed at Franklin and his kite, and made sport of Fulton and his steamboat. Had this spirit prevailed, all those mighty discoveries and inventions which have given man his empire over nature would never have been made, or would have been stifled in their birth. The melioration of laws for which humanity now justly applauds herself, the improvements in the science of government which in our case have taken a rapid stride towards perfection, would

never have been effected, and instead of having the spectacle of a free people to contemplate, we should have had only masters and slaves. No. The past does not, cannot, in the sense in which the stationary philosopher alleges it, measure the future. There has been through all the past a progress, and this bids us look for still greater hereafter. If from the past it be allowable to predict the future, let it be from past improvements that we infer future ones.

We cannot dismiss this article without referring to the duty which one generation owes to another. The child must be "trained up in the way he should go," but he cannot train himself. The education, at least its rudiments, must be *given*. Parents, guardians, or legislators must provide for it. The existing generation must bestow it on the rising. The rank the generation to come after us will hold, the advances in civilization which it will make, depend almost entirely on the education we give it. How, then, does our duty to educate *all* the children of our country rise in importance! How do almost all other considerations dwindle into insignificance, compared with this! Who does not in this recognise an immense responsibility which rests upon him? Who would shrink from it, and not do his duty?

For ourselves we are glad that the duty of educating one generation is given to another. It prevents us from feeling that we stand alone. It is an arrangement which connects us with all the past and with the whole future. We are an epitome of the vices and follies, the virtues and intelligence of all past ages; and our action, good or bad, upon the generation to follow us, will be felt by the remotest posterity. We occupy a commanding position. No action can be without its result. No word can drop idly to the ground. A word, little heeded when spoken, may kindle up a virtuous energy in some bosom, which shall pass from that to another, from that to still another, till there be collected a moral force sufficient to shake the empire of evil and then to create an entire new order of things. Every man may, in consequence of this law of our social development, be contributing something to the knowledge and virtue and happiness of the most distant generations. No one is too low, no one is too obscure, to be able to aid forward the glorious work of moral and social improvement. No matter how few or how apparently isolated from the world may be the friends of humanity, their exertions can never be lost. Their most private acts may prove to be the highest public benefits; their most secret devotions may be nourishing principles, cherishing a force of character which will one day pass from them to some beyond their circle, to increase in power and activity till the whole world feel and own their influence.

This is the grand secret of all human improvement, the action of man upon man and of generation upon generation. This is the principle by which Jesus accomplishes the grand reform he commenced. It was by the action of man upon man, of generation upon generation, that the germ of moral and social perfection which he deposited in the earth was to be nurtured into life. The nation in which he appeared has passed away. The conquerors of his countrymen have been conquered, and their conquerors in their turn have passed under the yoke, but that germ remains. It has sprung up, received fresh beauty and verdure from every storm which has passed over it, and it has now risen to afford shade and shelter to nearly half the earth; but that it has survived the revolutions of ages and reached its present growth has been the result of no other principle. Man has imparted something to man, and one individual has kindled up the soul of another. One generation has accumulated something that its predecessor had not, which it has imparted to its successor to be still enlarged.

Let us not overlook this grand principle of reform, and so long as we have it in our power thus to aid in setting the human race forward in the march of improvement let us not be discouraged. We have in our hands the lever which moves the moral world. Let us learn to use it with effect. Let us feel the sublime power with which it invests every individual of the human family. This lever is education; and when we see the mighty power it holds what importance does it not receive! what attention does it not demand! Let all our thoughts be turned towards the means of making it thorough, religious, universal, and with the least possible delay. We are called to do this by every consideration which can arrest the understanding or touch the heart. We are called to it by all our love of human happiness, by all our aversion to pain, by all our desire to share in great and glorious actions. Whoever we are, whatever our party, sect, creed, or mode of worship, here is a field broad enough for us all, and in which we may all labour in peace. Fathers and mothers! Religionists and politicians! Clergymen and legislators! Patriots, philanthropists, and reformers! Here is the object equal to your gentlest affections and to your loftiest ambition. Lend it the concentrated powers of all your minds and hearts, of your whole souls. God grant ye may!

O. A. Brownson.

Manly Piety, in its Principles. By ROBERT PHILIP, of Maberly Chapel. New York, 1833. 18mo. pp. 218.

MR. PHILIP is an Orthodox minister near London. He is publishing a series of "Guides" for young people. This is the first of the number. A preface has been obtained for this American edition from Rev. Albert Barnes, of Philadelphia, who some time since excited the odium of the Princeton school on account of his heresy, and who has more recently been known in this quarter by an able article on "Butler's Analogy," in the New-Haven Spectator. He assures us that he "should esteem it highly auspicious to the cause of pure and elevated piety, particularly among young men, if this book should receive a very extensive circulation." Why this opinion should have been expressed by this gentleman we could not divine until we reached the seventh essay. The book consists of eight essays on the following topics: Manly Estimates of both Worlds; Manly Estimates of True Wisdom; Manly Views of Salvation; Manly Faith in Providence; Manly Honesty in Prayer; Manly views of Divine Influence; Manly Views of Religious Mystery; Manly Views of Divine Holiness. In all these there is nothing very good or very bad; no great originality of thought or illustration; nothing very exciting or very improving; but much that is very well, quite clever, in our sense of the word.

But the seventh essay contains a direct attack upon Unitarianism. It is wholly devoted to this subject. By a very summary process he levels our system with the dust; that is, in his own estimation. Now that one whole chapter of this small volume should be devoted to this doctrine fully proves, in the first place, that in the neighbourhood of London this heresy was thought of sufficient importance to receive a laboured review; and in the second place, that in Philadelphia the danger of young men's being led astray by this faith exists to such a degree as to excite one of the most popular of the Orthodox preachers to aid the circulation of the book by his name and his pen. All this is well. We will now show our readers how skilfully this champion of mystery has demolished Unitarianism. Take the following specimen of calm reasoning, from the introduction:

"In a word, a religion without mystery must be a religion without a God; for the moment a God is admitted, mystery begins, and can never end. Unitarianism pretends, indeed, to be a religion without mysteries; and certainly it is not the fault of its votaries that any mystery cleaves to that system. They have done all that men could do to rid it of them; and somewhat more than even the devil ever ventured to try; for he did not venture to question the inspiration of the texts quoted against his proposals in the wilderness, nor to evade their force by analyzing their figures. But still, after all that has been

dared and done to rid Unitarianism of mystery, even the *oneness* of its God leaves him *incomprehensible*; and what more can Trinitarianism make him?" — pp. 161-2.

Our readers will perceive by this last question that our author is in no danger of being mistaken for a Solomon. We are told in Scripture that God is *one* person. This is a plain, simple proposition. This we can understand, comprehend, believe. But when we are told by the human creed that God exists in three distinct persons, that each one is God, that all are equal, that all are infinite in every perfection, and still that there are not three Gods, but only one God, we hear a contradictory assertion; we can neither understand, comprehend, nor believe. Now if Mr. Philip had desired to convince us that it is manly to believe mysteries, he should have shown us how we can believe a proposition to which no idea can be attached. Let us illustrate by an example. I solemnly declare in your presence this sentence, — "*Erbo di corece lavarco delecou.*" I assure you that this contains a most important truth, and that it is absolutely essential to your salvation to believe it. You reply that you cannot understand it, that you cannot form any idea of the meaning of the words. Very well. I repeat the sentence and assure you that it contains a great mystery. Can you believe it any easier for its being called mysterious? Surely not. We are nowhere required to believe mysteries, because this is an utter impossibility, and this every man of sense ought to know. A revelation is the explanation of a secret or mystery. Our Saviour came to give us a revelation of the Divine will. We do not deny that there are mysteries in almost everything, but we do not believe them, for we cannot; it is a moral impossibility to believe without ideas. And we would further remark, that we do not receive the devil as our exemplar in quoting or applying or explaining passages of holy writ. We prefer the teachings of Jesus and his apostles. But we must hasten to the arguments. These are three in number.

1. The first is this: In heaven songs of praise are addressed to God and the Lamb. He then infers from this assertion that Unitarianism is false and Trinitarianism true. How this can be made out is beyond our feeble comprehension. But listen to Mr. Philip: "What, therefore, could a Unitarian do there, but either confess that he had never believed the Bible, or charge all heaven with idolatry and error? This would be in fact his only alternative. He could do nothing but acknowledge himself to have been a fool on earth, or impeach the whole 'general assembly' of saints and angels, as idolaters." — p. 167. Now we will answer this reasoning after his own manner. What could a Trinitarian do in this heaven? Can he hear one song ascending to Father, Son, and Spirit, as the eternal Jehovah? No;

not a single hallelujah of this description can be heard from one end of the celestial regions to the other; but all are praising God and the Lamb. Who is this God? Is it not the God and Father of Jesus? Is it not the infinite Jehovah? And who is this Lamb? The equal Son of God, one of the three persons in the Trinity, a being who is also God himself? Look to the book to which our author has referred, for an answer. We are there told that this Lamb was *slain;* that he redeemed us to *God* by his *blood;* that he overcame, and was *rewarded* with the highest honours, by having a seat on his Father's throne; and much more of the same import. And not a single instance can be found in which he is represented as Deity, or one of the three persons of the Godhead; and not a single passage can be quoted to show that the holy spirit was ever mentioned in this heavenly worship. This argument is peculiarly unfortunate for our author; for it proves that his own worship on earth is wholly unscriptural, and that the songs recorded in Revelation are strictly Unitarian. It proves, therefore, on his own ground that our doctrine is infinite truth.

2. His second argument is this: "The *mysterious* creed is the only form of Christianity which has ever been successful or sanctifying in our world." — p. 168. This assertion ought first to be proved in order to make the reasoning good for anything. But this important step is forgotten, and the whole proposition necessarily falls to the ground. He does, indeed, assert this for fact in repeated instances; and he declares that Trinitarianism has been the religion of the majority for many centuries. He then infers that God would not have permitted this state of things unless this had been the truth. Now this argument proves a great deal too much, and is therefore worse than nothing. Take a few illustrations. The heathen religion has always been embraced by a majority of the human family. Would this have been suffered unless the system were divine truth? Mohammedanism numbers more than Christianity. Would this have been permitted unless their sentiments were correct? The Catholics are the largest denomination of Christians. Would this have been allowed unless theirs were the true church? Mr. Philip's mode of reasoning wholly destroys his supposed argument. And this is too frequently the method adopted by our Orthodox brethren; they appeal to the majority of numbers to prove the truth of their system; while the majority at different periods of the church have been Unitarian in sentiment.

3. The third argument is this: "The manifest inconsistency between the *tenor* of Scripture and the *tenor* of Unitarianism. As my limits impose the utmost brevity, I must have recourse to a mode of illustration which will give *multum in parvo.*" — p. 181. Now what is this short cut? Why, Mr. Philip supposes after five hundred years the Unitarian doctrine to have be-

come dominant, and then that some minister of talents and influence addresses a circular to the Unitarian churches. He gives us a copy of what this letter ought to be. He has taken a few texts of Scripture from their connexion and applied them to Jesus. He then infers that no Unitarian could use the words of the Bible when speaking of Christ, and consequently the system must be false. Now this is the most unfortunate argument of the whole. It is at once annihilated by facts. Trinitarianism has been kept alive only by the constant use of human creeds. One of the great men in England would not circulate the Bible without the creed, because all the common people would become Unitarians if they read nothing but the Scriptures. Whole societies of Methodists and large numbers of the Baptists of that country embraced Unitarianism just so soon as they renounced allegiance to human creeds. In this country the Christian sect have established more than a thousand churches within thirty years, and all are Unitarian. How has this been done? Simply by giving up human creeds, and taking the Bible as the only standard of Divine truth. This always has been the result where the experiment has been tried; and this always will be the result so long as our Bible reads as it now stands. *Our* creed is the Bible, and we can express our peculiar sentiments in the very language of inspiration. This our *mysterious* believers cannot, or else they would not swear their theological professors and bind down their church-members to a human formulary of faith. We think, therefore, that Mr. Philip's pretended arguments are refuted.

B. Whitman.

The Christian Knowledge Society's Tracts.

The Christian Knowledge Society is, we believe, the richest institution of the kind in Great Britain. Its income for the year 1832 amounted to more than the enormous sum of seventy thousand pounds, or three hundred and twelve thousand dollars. It is connected with the Established Church, and its object is to circulate cheap publications on Christian doctrine, morals, and piety, and with a particular view to the conversion of Dissenters and the defence of the Establishment. In some late numbers of the Christian Observer (the organ of the evangelical party of the Church of England), there have been some severe animadversions on the character of many of the tracts which the Society has thought it proper to issue. The Observer talks of "the theology patronised by the Society," and tells us that many of its publications contain doctrines which are decidedly heretical, and that there is a growing dissatisfaction among a portion of its members on that account. It seems that the theology which is

the subject of these strictures does not recognise the doctrines of original depravity and of "faith alone," and has distinctly asserted that a holy life is necessary to a participation in the benefits of the atonement. It has also advanced some notions on the influence of the holy spirit, which do not appear to be satisfactory at all. We have none of the Society's publications, and of course cannot judge how far the strictures are true. Some of those which are pronounced heretical are written by distinguished clergymen of the Establishment, and we hope that they may be regarded as signs of the times. The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England are susceptible of such different interpretations, and it has been so difficult to learn the views of the great body of those who subscribe to them, that we are glad to see anything which looks like a definite expression of opinion from such respectable authorities as the writers of many of these tracts. We cannot tell to what extent the publications of the Society are an organ of the Church, but we judge that they must necessarily take their tone from the prevailing sentiments. J. Q. Day.

Works in Press.

A neat duodecimo volume of sermons has been selected from the manuscripts of the late Rev. Ezra S. Goodwin, of Sandwich, and a memoir written by the Rev. H. B. Goodwin of Concord. The work will be ready for delivery some time this month. Those who have heard this able divine preach will need no recommendation of ours. To those who are unacquainted with his writings we can most cordially recommend the forthcoming volume.

It must be highly gratifying to the friends of Liberal Christianity to learn that a large octavo volume of sermons by the late Dr. Parker, of Portsmouth, accompanied by a memoir from the gifted pen of Rev. Prof. H. Ware, Jr., is soon to be given to the public. As the profits arising from the sale of the work are to be appropriated to the education of his only child and son, we trust the number of subscribers for the work will be large.

Messrs. Manson, Emerson, and Grant, of Cambridge, are printing a duodecimo edition of King James's Bible. The text will be divided into paragraphs according to the sense, and the poetical parts will be arranged metrically. The duties of editorship devolve mainly upon the Rev. Mr. Coit, of the Episcopal church; and mentioning his name, we furnish a guarantee for the fidelity and accuracy of the edition. We hope the work will be liberally patronized, since we believe, from the specimens we have seen, it will be a very great improvement upon former editions. We learn that the Massachusetts Bible Society has passed a vote in approbation of the enterprise.

CORRESPONDENCE AND INTELLIGENCE.

INFIDEL MISSIONARIES.

It is probably known to many of our readers that Robert Taylor and Richard Carlisle have taken the name of "Infidel Missionaries," and for some years have been very industriously disseminating their demoralizing notions throughout England. They have been prosecuted and punished for their indecencies and blasphemies, and this inexpedient measure of some overzealous Christians has given them a notoriety and an influence with certain classes which they could not otherwise have secured. Several of their low, vile, scandalous works have been republished by the infidels in our own country, and are obtaining a somewhat extensive circulation among the uneducated and unprincipled, on whom they may produce the most injurious consequences. I requested, some months since, a distinguished gentleman in England to furnish me the means of estimating their true character, acquirements, influence, and success. From the answer to my letter I present the following extract, intending hereafter to give some further notice of these notorious individuals.

"Of the character of Taylor and Carlisle I will, if I can, enable you to judge by the documents I send. The first, however, I consider little better than a madman, and the second little better than a villain. If left unpersecuted they would both by this time have been nearly or quite extinct. As it is, they have neither learning nor character to influence any but the morally and physically lowest. For a long time their influence has been on the decrease. Unbelievers of good character and easy circumstances shun contact with them as with degradation. Among the morally low of the working classes they have an influence, and I am told that in a political respect Carlisle's influence has been extending. He has certainly been over the country on a mission of devilism — it is said, organizing the means of forcible resistance to the civil power, but I think he has more sense than to commit himself in any such plan. Carlisle was originally a tinker. Taylor was educated at Cambridge, and has more learning than sense. Both are bad men. Carlisle is a filthy sensualist. He is now living in what he calls, and recommends, 'a moral marriage,' that is, in adultery. They and their followers are wholly lost in delusion, deceit, and for the most part open sin."

LETTER FROM BUFFALO, NEW YORK.

"Buffalo is a place which contains persons of almost every variety of opinion, from the most exclusive bigot down to the confirmed skeptic. The predominant sect in this city is the Presbyterian. They have two meeting-houses, one of which is among the largest belonging to that denomination in the state. During the past winter *Burchardism*, as it is here called in common parlance, has filled the city with religious wildfire. Burchard, the author of the confusion, is well known here as the most prominent revivalist in this part of the country. Although he boasted of having made seven hundred converts, including two hundred children, as the fruits of his eight weeks' labour in Buffalo, yet it is said, that, after leaving here, he represented the inhabitants as the most incorrigible of all sinners. An indifference on the subject of religion is already, I believe, apprehended, if it is not now felt, in the very congregations in which his efforts produced the tremendous effervescence. This any reflecting person might naturally have supposed would follow as the fruits of such extravagance and folly.

"Besides a Catholic, a Calvinistic Baptist, and a Methodist Congregation, about which I have not particularly inquired, there is, in this city, a Unitarian and also a Restorationist society. The Unitarians, as you already know, own a neat and handsome house of worship, which was completed last fall, and dedicated by Mr. Pierpont of Boston. This society, though not large, is composed of members truly zealous and liberal, as well as highly respectable and intelligent. An English gentleman, of good talents and education, the Rev. W. S. Brown, has been administering to this society for the last eighteen months. He has, however, dissolved his connexion with this people and left here this week for the South, whither his family had repaired on account of ill health. Mr. Brown's society seem strongly and ardently attached to him. They, of course, parted with him reluctantly. The community speak of him in terms of high commendation. It was related to me that an individual was heard to say, a few days since, "Mr Brown is no doubt an excellent man"; to which another readily assented, adding, "But his principles"—meaning his Unitarian sentiments—"every body knows are very bad!" The Unitarians in this place are opposed strongly by a large portion of the inhabitants, but among themselves they are perfectly united. They are hoping and expecting, at no distant period, a clergyman from the East, to supply the place of Mr. Brown.

"The Restorationist society in this city have likewise a very convenient and elegant house of worship; but have not yet a settled pastor. It is stated here that considerable difference of sentiment exists in this society; that several who have connected themselves with it are believers in modern Universalism, and object to the settlement of a Restorationist minister. It is a matter of course that those who hold to the doctrine of the final restoration, and such as confine all the effects of sin to this mortal life, when united in society-relationship, find it extremely difficult to agree in a clergyman who can satisfy the wants of all. This fact, if nothing else, is, I think, producing a conviction on the public mind that a real and essential difference does exist between the opinions of these two classes of believers. Many members of the Restorationist society, of which I have spoken, are highly respectable for intelligence and moral worth."

We take the liberty of subjoining the following extract of a private letter from the Rev. Mr. Brown, in confirmation of the foregoing.

"It is yet the day of small things with us, and there are strong prejudices against us, limited very much, however, to the ladies. The intelligent men of the city are generally favourable, and have manifested their feelings more unreservedly of late, in consequence of a violent attack which was made upon us by Mr. Burchard, the revivalist clergyman. I challenged him to meet me and discuss the subject, and having received no reply, I delivered a few lectures in answer to his charges and (I was about to say) arguments, which were attended by large audiences; and I have reason to believe I succeeded in exciting a strong feeling in favour of our opinions and an increased determination on the part of the most respectable portion of the community to frown upon any further attempt to oppress and defraud us. The last remark will scarcely be intelligible until I have informed you that the chief object of the revivalist party in bringing Mr. Burchard here was understood to be '*to crush the Unitarians.*'"

EXTRACTS OF LETTERS FROM A MORMONITE.

A gentleman in this immediate vicinity early became affected with the Mormon delusion. His rank in life, his respectability, his education, his talents, his Christian character, were equal to those of the

majority of the Orthodox church to which he belonged. He removed his family to the West and joined the deluded multitude of fanatics who were collecting from all parts of the country. We have been favoured with the perusal of two long letters which he wrote last autumn to his aged father, and are permitted to take such extracts as may interest our readers. We present the following specimens, believing they will show very clearly the effects of error and fanaticism.

"*Independence, Missouri, December*, 1833.

"Dear Father,

"The village of Independence stands on the south bank of Missouri river; it contains thirty houses. One half a mile to the west there is a beautiful cultivated spot of one hundred and fifty acres. Notwithstanding the dark cloud which appears to hang over our heads at this time, on this spot of land will shortly be built the temple, and the city of the New Jerusalem, into which our Lord and Saviour will descend in a cloud from heaven with power and great glory. We have a plan given by revelation of the city and the temple. The temple is to be like Solomon's, only far more splendid. Many of our dear brethren, who have been driven from this land by our enemies, will shortly return in the Lord's due time, and help to accomplish this great and glorious work. I have sufficient authority for saying this, for the Lord hath spoken it.

"The inhabitants of Jackson county are mostly emigrants from Kentucky and Tennessee. They are generally an indolent and illiterate people. They have been very friendly to us till within six months. They are mostly enemies to the cause of Christ. This county is ruled by about twenty-five rich and designing men from the Southern States, who are mostly engaged in trafficking amongst the Indians. The leaders of this body are about half a dozen of those who receive pay from government and your missionary society. Yea, there was Mr. M., the Baptist missionary to the Indians, who was the leader of a mob of thirty-two who fell upon us in November, and sware in their wrath that they would slay us, if we were not off in twenty-four hours. So the Lord suffers the lofty-minded hypocrite to show out the evil of his heart, that his condemnation may be just. These great men all had a hand in pulling down our printing-office. Great was the waste of property. Thousands of bushels of grain were trodden under feet. Houses were destroyed. Through the mercy of God we all have abundance to subsist on yet. The price of wheat is fifty cents, corn twelve and a half cents, per bushel; beef and pork two and a half to three dollars per hundred.

"You wished to know how we spend the Sabbath. We mean to spend it as the Lord has commanded us by revelation. We are strictly forbidden to do any other work on the Lord's day but to prepare our food, and to assemble ourselves together to worship the Lord. We commence our service with prayer. Then it is the duty of every member, both old and young, to arise, one at a time, and speak of the goodness of God, and to confess our sins, if we have committed any the past week, to one another and before the Lord. This is frequently done in an unknown tongue, and then interpreted by one who may have the spirit for this work. Here is the wisdom of the Lord to search out all iniquity; for many of us have been moved by the Spirit and spoke in another tongue that which, when interpreted, would prove to be the secrets of the heart and sinful deeds that we should not confess in our own tongues. Many a one has risen with tears in his eyes, and confessed the truth of the interpretation. Furthermore, in obedience to the commands of the Lord, we on every Sabbath commemorate the death and sufferings of our Lord and Saviour, by partaking of the bread and wine, yea, pure wine, the clear juice of the grape. Our branch made one barrel this fall.

"We have had many trying scenes to pass through since we arrived here

one year ago. The Lord spake by revelation that he was not well pleased with his children in Zion, and that we all had great need of repentance, pointing out our greatest sins, which were, breaking the law of the celestial kingdom, and not reading the book of Mormon. Again we received the word of the Lord in June by revelation through the prophet in Kirtland, that we had much iniquity amongst us, that he would not have his holy land polluted, and that there was a scourge and a judgment awaiting the inhabitants of Zion. Accordingly our chastisements were very severe. Many were cut off from the church from that time. For several weeks we received great blessings from the Lord. The most of the church that stood received the gift of tongues, to speak in the language of the Lemanites as well as in those of the isles of the sea and the nations of Ur. It was given to some in each branch of the church to interpret all that was spoken; and also it was given to many of us to prophesy of things shortly to take place. James lived with me last summer; he bids fair to make a holy child; he can speak in as many as twenty-five different tongues."

LETTER FROM BERKSHIRE COUNTY.

Dear Sir,

I have received the first two numbers of "The Unitarian" and am much pleased with them. A work of this kind was greatly needed, and I doubt not will effect great good. What we want in such a work is a manifestation of strong, practical good sense; a thorough sifting of all religious extravagance and intolerance; an honest, straight-forward pursuit of truth; a vigorous crusade against the system of imposition by which modern revivals are "got up," carried forward, and consummated. We wish to be taught that religion is not, like our Sunday vestments, to be merely put on upon certain occasions, and then put off again; but that it should be worn through the whole week and at all times; that its manifestations should be seen in our sobriety, our temperance, our honesty, our charity, our industry, and in the cheerful performance of *all* our duties, as men, and citizens. Is it unsafe to teach that social service is religious service?

It seems to me that the modern revival system lies at the foundation of the difficulty; for how few persons, after joining themselves to Orthodox churches, feel an inclination to pursue any inquiry which may tend to weaken their faith in the dogmas of their church! I think, however, we have much to hope from the dissensions going on between the two Orthodox parties. They exhibit conclusive evidence of the purifying and holy tendency of the exclusively *evangelical* creeds. The excessive tenderness and delicacy exhibited towards each other finds its counterpart only in the gentle buffetings which both unite in bestowing on the contemptible Unitarians. In Berkshire we have no Unitarian societies; but in many Orthodox societies with which I am acquainted I know there are many persons of respectability and intelligence who avow themselves Unitarians, and many others who are ready to accept almost any system in preference to the present. What can they do? Shall they break loose from the mass, and voluntarily set themselves apart for martyrdom? The revivals have come along periodically and swept their wives, their children, and their friends into the church. It matters not how unexceptionable the character of these men may be, they are prayed for as "impenitent," "ungodly," "workers of iniquity," "opposers of God and religion." It is true that names are not often called in public, but descriptions are given which point the *offenders* out so clearly that the congregation, great and small, are at no great loss. The old clergymen in general, much to their credit, are raising a feeble opposition to the new measures, but they find zealous

advocates of those measures among the fanatical and fiery spirits of their own churches at times, and the young clergy of the New-Haven school are generally supposed to be advocates of the system.

Young females and children compose a majority of the subjects or *victims* of the revivals in this neighbourhood. Young females, from an excess of zeal, have frequently overstepped the modesty of nature, and solicited interviews with the other sex, for the purpose of aiding in their conversion. As the father of a somewhat numerous family I dread the prevalence of all such extravagance and fanaticism as will have a tendency to produce in my daughters a disregard to the delicate proprieties of life, as well as that over excitement of the nervous system which unhinges the mind and prepares them to become inmates of the insane hospitals, as many hundreds have been.

THEOLOGICAL DISCUSSION IN BOSTON.

Boston, April 4, 1834.

My Dear Sir,

Your favour of the 1st inst. was duly and gratefully received. You request me to give my opinion of the recent discussion in this city between Messrs. A. Ballou and D. D. Smith, upon the subject of future retribution. This I freely and cheerfully give; the more so, because the opinion of the parties has been freely expressed, in which I perceive both claim the honour of a victory. This I did not expect; for I supposed that the manifest and positive success of Mr. Ballou, in sustaining the affirmative of the question, would not be contested by the most ardent friends of Ultra-Universalism; especially as Mr. Smith failed to show that the proof-texts of Mr. Ballou might not and did not mean what he asserted and proved they did. It is true, Mr. Smith boldly asserted that the texts had no reference to a future state; but in applying them to the present state of existence he was under the necessity of giving explanations, which, to say the least, were not very rational.

I present one example. Mr. Ballou adduced the following text in support of future retribution, from 2 Tim. iv. 6–8. "*For I am now ready to be offered*," &c. In reply, Mr. Smith contended that the passage had no reference to a future state, but to this only. Paul had been a faithful servant of Jesus Christ, was now about to suffer martyrdom, and leave a *name* by which, in all future ages of the church, he would be crowned, as a faithful apostle and minister of Jesus Christ, with a *Crown of Fame!!!* Therefore the passage did not prove that men would be rewarded in the next life for the deeds done in this. Mr. Ballou contended that there was a crown laid up for Paul, "and not for him *only*, but for *all* who loved the Lord's appearing;" — that "the Lord, the righteous judge" — not the church on earth — would "give it at that day."

I consider the above expositions fair specimens of those given by the gentlemen in the course of the debate. I give Mr. Smith great credit for his ingenuity in the management of his cause, but must say his expositions of the Scriptures sometimes astonished me; e. g. Paul's *crown of fame*, — the resurrection of the just, — the second death, — the last days, — the end of the world. A cause that requires such expositions of the word of God to sustain it, I am fully satisfied, can never be the cause of truth.

I therefore give the preference to Mr. Ballou. He used no management or sophistry, his expositions were clear and rational, and it appeared to me they were "mighty in pulling down the strong holds," and in giving the cause of truth a glorious triumph. A report of the debate is to be published soon, to which I appeal for the correctness of my opinion.

Yours, with respect,

Joshua V. Himes.

MONTHLY LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS,

JUST RECEIVED BY

JAMES MUNROE AND CO.,

Booksellers to the University.

The Practice in Civil Actions and Proceedings at Law, in Massachusetts. By Samuel Howe, late Judge of the Court of Common Pleas. Edited by Richard S. Fay and Jonathan Chapman, Counsellors at Law.

Lives of Alexander Wilson and Captain John Smith,—being Vol. 2d of "The Library of American Biography," conducted by Jared Sparks.

The Doctrine of the Bible concerning the Messiah. By an Aged Layman.

Sermons on Duties belonging to some of the Conditions and Relations of Private Life. By John G. Palfrey, A. M., Prof. of Biblical Literature in the University of Cambridge.

Remarks on Mr. Norton's "Statement of Reasons."

Helen, a Tale, by Maria Edgeworth, 2 vols.

Virgil. The Eclogues translated by Wrangham,—The Georgics by Sotheby,—and The Æneid by Dryden; in two vols., being vols. 11 and 12 of the Classical Library.

The American Gentleman's Medical Pocket-Book and Health Adviser.

The American Lady's Medical Pocket-Book and Nursery Adviser.

An Account of Jane C. Rider, the Springfield Somnambulist. By L. W. Belden, M. D.

The Every Day Book for Youth. By Peter Parley. Illustrated by numerous Engravings.

The Village Choir, 2d Edition.

A General View of the Geology of Scripture. By George Fairholme, Esq.

Memoir of Rev. Gordon Hall, one of the First Missionaries of the Amer. Board of Comm. for For. Missions at Bombay. By Horatio Bardwell.

The Marriage Present.

The Book of the Indians of North America. By Samuel G. Drake. 3d Edition.

Lord Neal, a Romance, in four Cantos.

The Wizzard's Grace, etc. By J. M. M.

Scripture Animals, or Natural History of the Living Creatures named in the Bible, written especially for Youth. By Jonathan Fisher.

Instructions for Young Christians. By Lyman Beecher, D. D.

Travels and Researches in Caffraria; describing the Character, Customs, and Moral Condition of the Tribes inhabiting that portion of Southern Africa. By Stephen Kay.

Familiar Anecdotes of Sir Walter Scott. By James Hogg, the Ettrick Shepherd.

Pilgrims of the Rhine, a Novel, by Bulwer.

JAMES MUNROE & Co. have for sale the following Theological Works:—

Jeremy Taylor's Complete Works.
Barrow's Works.
Sherlock's do.
Hall's do.
Butler's do.
Lightfoot's do.
Lardner's do.
Doddridge's do.
Paley's do.
Priestley's do.
Price's do.
Leighton's do.
Porteus's do.
Tillotson's do.
Blair's do.
Chalmers's do.
Fenelon's do.
Rees's Racovian Catechism.
Farmer on the Temptation.
——— on Miracles.
——— on Demoniacs.
Marsh's Michaelis.
Cogan's Ethical Works.
Hartley on Man.
Pascal's Thoughts.
Gleig's History of the Bible.
Sparks's Tracts.
Boetius's Consolations.
Burnet's History of the Reformation.
Claude's do. do.
Blackwall's Sacred Classics.
Waddington's Church History.
Jenning's Jewish Antiquities.
Jahn's Archæology.
——— Hebrew Commonwealth.
——— Introduction to Old Testament.
Fleury's Manners and Customs of the Israelites.
Burder's Oriental Customs.
Patrick and Lowth's Commentary on the Sacred Scriptures.
Wells's do. do.
Taylor on Romans.
Wakefield on Matthew.
Porteus on do.
Noyes's Job, Psalms, and Prophets.
Blayney's Jeremiah.
Macknight on the Epistles.
Gillies' New Testament.
Lowman on Revelation.
Carpenter's do. to Sacred Scriptures.
Hug's do. to New Testament.
Theological Repository.
General Repository.
Christian Disciple, Old and New Series.
Do. Examiner, Old and New Series.
Unitarian Miscellany.
Do. Advocate.
Biblical Repository.
Scriptural Interpreter.

JAMES MUNROE AND CO.

HAVE JUST PUBLISHED,

Ware's Life of the Saviour, *stereotype edition.*

Lowth's Isaiah, from the tenth English edition, carefully corrected and revised.

Stewart's Philosophy of the Human Mind. 8vo. 2d ed.

Briggs's Sermon at the Installation of Rev. A. B. Muzzey.

Wood's Discourse, on Gospel-Truths.

Two Discourses delivered before the First Parish in Cambridge; one, upon leaving the Old Meeting House, and the other, at the Dedication of the New. By William Newell, Pastor of the First Church in Cambridge.

This Day Published,

Volume 3 of Ware's Sunday Library, being *The Holy Land and its Inhabitants.* By Rev. S. G. Bulfinch, of Augusta, Georgia. Illustrated by a Map of Palestine.

Will be published in a few days,

Views of Christian Truth, Piety, and Morality, selected from the writings of Dr. Priestley, with an Introductory Notice of his Life and Character. By Rev. Henry Ware, Jr.

Sunday-School and Parish Libraries will be promptly furnished, to order, on the most liberal terms.

Orders for any work published either in this country or in Europe will be attended to without delay.

The establishment of an hourly communication with the city, by coaches and baggage-wagons, enables us to assure distant customers of the execution of all orders transmitted by mail, with about the same despatch as can be had in Boston.

Liberal terms will be allowed to authors who may favour us with the publication of their works. No pains will be spared to bring out all books in good style and with despatch, and to give them extensive circulation.

BOOKBINDING.

Henry P. McGee has the pleasure to inform his friends that he has taken Mr. Thomas Bason (from London) as partner in his business, which will be conducted in future under the firm of McGEE & BASON.

Mr. Bason is a first rate workman, and has had great experience in the finest styles of finishing in London, and has also finished, in Boston, very recently, some of the handsomest work ever offered in the city.

Rebinding, in all the various styles usually required in a gentleman's library, will be done, with attention to durability, as well as with the utmost neatness. McGEE & BASON.

H. P. McGee, grateful for the very liberal encouragement given since his commencement of business in Cambridge, assures his friends that his work will now be done in a superior manner.

Hilliard, Metcalf, and Olney, Printers, Cambridge.

THE

MAY 15 1945

UNITARIAN.

Vol. I. No. 7.

JULY, 1834.

CONDUCTED

BY BERNARD WHITMAN.

CAMBRIDGE:
JAMES MUNROE AND COMPANY.
BOSTON:
RUSSELL, ODIORNE, AND METCALF.
1834.

...ber contains 2 sheets — Postage, under 100 miles, 3 cents — over 100 miles, 5 cents.

CONTENTS.

PAGE.

Meaning of the Text, Matt. xxviii. 19. H. A. MILES. 303
Manufactures in their Influence upon Pauperism. No. II. *Large Manufacturing Establishments*. J. H. M. 310
Jesus a Divine Teacher of Morals. A. P. PEABODY. 315
The Prophecy of the Destruction of Jerusalem. G. E. ELLIS. 318
The Religion of Intelligent Men. J. FARR. 325
Salvation by Jesus. O. A. BROWNSON. 329

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Bulfinch's Poems. 343
Mr. Dunlap's Speech in Defence of Abner Kneeland.
Arguments of the Attorney of the Commonwealth in Kneeland's Trial . . 346

CORRESPONDENCE AND INTELLIGENCE.

Letter from the Rev. J. Farr to the Rev. Adin Ballou on the Subject of Exchanges between the Restorationists and Unitarians. 348

THE UNITARIAN is issued in monthly numbers, by JAMES MUNROE and Co., *Cambridge, Mass.* Each number will contain, on an average, 48 pages royal 12mo., [i. e. octavo size], and be printed on good paper and with handsome type. The price will be two dollars per annum, payable on the first of March. To those who procure and become responsible for six subscribers a seventh copy will be furnished *gratis*. The usual discount to Agents. All business letters to be addressed to the publishers.

Our Subscribers are reminded that payment became due on the receipt of the March number. Gentlemen to whom subscription-papers were sent are respectfully requested to collect and forward to the publishers, James Munroe & Co., Cambridge, Mass., the amount due from the several subscribers whose names they have sent us.

It is particularly requested of our subscribers to make their payments in Massachusetts' or United States' Bank Notes; since the discount on all other bills involves a considerable loss.

It is intended to notice all the books and pamphlets which may be received, so far as they fall within the plan of this work. It is, therefore, respectfully requested of authors and publishers to forward copies of such publications.

The Editor will hold himself responsible for no articles except his own.

This Day Published,

BY

JAMES MUNROE & CO.,

Booksellers to the University.

Views of Christian Truth, Piety, and Morality, selected from the Writings of Dr. Priestley, with an Introductory Notice of his Life and Character. By Rev. Henry Ware, Jr.

Volume III. of Ware's Sunday Library, being *The Holy Land and its Inhabitants*. By Rev. S. G. Bulfinch, of Augusta, Georgia. Illustrated by a Map of Judea.

Cambridge, June 1, 1834.

THE UNITARIAN.

VOL. I. JULY 1, 1834. No. 7.

The Meaning of the Text, Matt. xxviii. 19.

"Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

It is the object of this article to inquire what it is to baptize one in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.—With most of our readers there may be need of having intelligible ideas on this subject. Accustomed in our earlier years to look upon this text as a proof of a doctrine which inquiry and maturer judgment have led us to reject, a lingering regard for former prejudices may be present in the mind, whenever, in the solemnity of baptism, the phrase, "The Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost," is repeated. And by many we may be thought to be placed in an unfortunate situation; since, when we would offer either ourselves or our little ones in baptism, we are obliged to repeat a form of expression which is regarded as making against those views of Christianity to which we desire to devote both ourselves and those whose religious education is committed to our hands. An indistinct sense of this we ourselves may have at times felt; and I cannot but think that it has done much to lessen in our minds the significance and interest of the ordinance in question. We shall do well, then, to endeavour to understand the language of our text, to know to whom and to what we are baptized, to comprehend, as nearly as may be, the full and important meaning which our Saviour undoubtedly attached to this last communication and commission to his disciples. We can accomplish all this only by first considering the usage of the times in respect to baptism, and by interpreting our Lord's

language in reference to his prior instructions and to the prospects of his religion.

A mistaken notion is not altogether uncommon, that the idea involved in baptism is that of *dedication*. In baptism it is thought we are *dedicated* to the Father, to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost. But a little consideration will show that this is incorrect. The Jews were accustomed to baptize all who were converts to their religion, and the ceremony was regarded *as a profession of belief*. Thus we read, "Our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and were all *baptized into Moses* in the cloud and in the sea," i. e. they were not dedicated to Moses, but they professed faith in him. The word is uniformly so used in the New Testament. The believers were all "*batpized into Christ*", into a faith in him. They were "*baptized into one body*", — into belief in, and admission into, one household of believers. They were "*baptized into his death*", — into a belief of his crucifixion. "Were ye *baptized in the name of Paul?*" into a belief in Paul as the master and head of the church. In the last cited instance we have a phrase that occurs in the text, — *in the name of* Paul — *in the name of* the Lord, — a circumlocution of which the Jews were fond, and which was simply an expletive, as "to call on the name of the Lord" is the same as "to call on the Lord." The meaning of the text, then, is, "Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing into a belief of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

1. "Go and baptize all nations into a belief of the *Father*."

The God of the Jews was Jehovah, a Being whose name they would not pronounce but with the most mysterious awe, and who, as they thought, made no manifestations of himself, except in rare and peculiar instances, to any but the High Priest in the temple. The Jews thought God was a *vindictive* Being, pursuing with wrath and hatred those who had offended him, and whose kindness and love could be propitiated only by costly rites and sacrifices. The Jews thought God was a *partial* Being, bestowing all care and favour upon the descendants of Abraham, and treating the rest of mankind either as beneath his notice, or as his open enemies. The Jews thought their God entertained and was influenced by human feelings and passions, they imagined that he was pleased with their external cleanness and outward observances, and that he delighted in the incense of the altar and in the blood of the sacrifices. The Jews thought God was a Being whose care of his children extended but little beyond this term of their

existence; he had done much, they thought, to adapt this world to minister to their comfort and happiness, but they recognised little in their own nature which was adapted for another, a spiritual, an eternal existence.

Now in opposition to all this, and in opposition to as false and more debasing views of the heathen, the great truth which Christ taught, the *first* truth, the first in importance, the first in his divine system of religion, the great central truth which gives to that system its peculiarity and worth, was that God is our Father. He is our Father, not because he made us and watches over us; he made the plant and the tree, and he watches over them, yet we do not call him their Father. The relation is a spiritual one, and therefore it is nearer, and, if felt, more endearing. He is our Father because he has given us spirits like his own, he has imparted to us his own immortality, and has blessed us with that noblest of all his gifts, a capacity of ever-growing holiness and joy. How successfully does this great truth, as unfolded by Jesus Christ, war with all the unworthy opinions the Jews entertained of God! He has a name the repetition of which we need not shun, nor which when we must pronounce it, should be uttered with a chilling dread or superstitious awe; with delight and joy we may pronounce that name, and in all our blessed communications with the great Power above us Christ hath taught us to say, "Our Father who art in Heaven." There is no privileged priest to whom alone he reveals himself, nor is there any gorgeous temple to which his communications are confined; the choice temple of his residence is the pure heart, and the priest that enjoys his holiest revelations is he who seeks to do his will. He is no vindictive Being; he is enemy to no one; and those who are enemies to him he seeks to overcome by exhibiting to them a goodness which shall constrain them to repentance. He is no partial Being, no privileged nation or race are the sole recipients of his favours; the blessings of his hand are bestowed as freely and as impartially as are the beams of the sun and the showers from heaven. He delights in no costly sacrifices which the sons of plenty alone can offer; the sacrifices of God are a broken and a contrite heart, which the lowliest of his children can bestow. His chief care has been exercised not merely in adapting the circumstances of this life to minister to our convenience and enjoyment; his great regard to us is shown in making this life a fit introduction to a discipline for the life to come. Glorious as this world is in itself, we see but half its marks of wisdom and love till

we look upon it as the temporary scene of the first stage of man's spiritual life. Our Father's great love to us is seen in surrounding us with so many monitors of the better world. We can conceive of no greater exercise of God's power than is shown in making spirits that shall live on, when all this universe of worlds shall be wrapt together as a scroll, and enduing them with capacities for an angel's knowledge and blessedness and love. He has revealed to us a destiny higher and holier than ever dawned upon the mind of the Jew, because he has revealed himself as "our Father who is in heaven." Thus how much is implied in the great truth of God's paternal character! Do we wonder that Christ should have made it a chief object of his teachings to state and illustrate a doctrine so important and fundamental? Do we wonder that he should have selected it as the first truth into a belief of which his disciples were to baptize all nations?

2. Let us consider the second truth into a belief in which the disciples were commissioned to baptize. "Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them into a belief in the Son." Next to the great truth of God's paternal character and of the near and spiritual relation we sustain to him, what is the truth which appears to our own minds most important, and which we ourselves should next mention in a brief synopsis of Christian doctrines? Is it not that which is next mentioned in the text, our Father's gift of his Son, his sending a messenger of grace, mercy, and peace to us, the revelation of light and strength and hope and promise by him? Now at the time this commission to baptize was given, the great body of the Jews believed that their long expected Messiah had not appeared. They had heard of Jesus, but he was not the Christ. Their Saviour was yet to come. The command of Jesus to his disciples was to baptize the Jews into a belief, first, of the paternal character of God, then into a belief that his Son had appeared, the Messiah had come, the new dispensation had been given, the promised kingdom had been set up. Or if we look to the then Gentile world, we shall find a state of feeling existing which rendered the requirement of a belief in the Son peculiarly pertinent and necessary. Some distinguished men of the heathen world were at this time expecting a revelation from God. Probably this expectation was in part natural to the human mind, it might also have been received by communicating with the Jews, or it might have been handed down by tradition from distinguished philosophers of antiquity, some of whom expressed strong conviction that God would

in a miraculous manner reveal himself to mankind. However acquired, the expectation was by some certainly entertained; but the idea that *Jesus* was the channel through whom divine truth was communicated to men was undoubtedly to many, as it was to the Greeks, foolishness, and as it was to the Hebrews, a stumbling-block. Others, again, were in no such expectation of a revelation from heaven, and would be backward in believing that such a revelation had been made. But the learned and the unlearned heathen, the Jew and Gentile, men of all nations, were the disciples to baptize to a belief in the Son, to a conviction that a message had been sent from on high and sent by God's chosen messenger, to a faith in a new revelation of clearer light, of more quickening motives, of more purifying and elevating truths, and of glorious, even immortal hopes. Surely this great truth was in our Saviour's teaching second only to the higher truth of God's paternal character, and therefore he selected it as the next great truth into which his disciples were to baptize all nations.

3. But he mentions one other. "Go ye and teach all nations baptizing into a belief in the Holy Ghost." We are plainly given to understand what this Holy Ghost is in the first five verses of the nineteenth chapter of Acts. We there read that Paul came to Ephesus, "and finding certain disciples he said unto them, Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. And he said unto them, Unto what, then, were ye baptized? And they said, Unto John's baptism. Then Paul baptized them in the name of the Lord Jesus; and when he had laid his hands upon them the Holy Ghost came upon them, and they spake with tongues and prophesied." Now here you will observe these five things. 1. That although these men are called *disciples*, they had never heard of the Holy Ghost, and consequently could not have believed that the Holy Ghost was a person in the Godhead. 2. That neither before nor after their baptism is it said that Paul informed them that the Holy Ghost was a distinct person, but leaves them to learn from the consequence of his laying his hands upon them what the Holy Ghost is. 3. That Paul speaks of the Holy Ghost *as something to be received;* not as a person — but as what *should come upon them.* 4. That when they had miraculous power from God they had the Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost, then, is the miraculous power of God. All Scripture confirms this. Jesus and John, Elizabeth and Zacharias, Peter and Stephen,

were filled with the Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost came upon the apostles on the day of Pentecost. To be baptized into the Holy Ghost is to be baptized into a belief of the miraculous power of God. 5. Into a faith in this miraculous power, Paul, by his question to the disciples, implies that *they ought* to have been baptized. Are we not, therefore, bound to conclude that this miraculous power is what our Saviour alluded to in the commission we are considering, and under which Paul acted? Now what pertinency was there, it may be asked, in our Saviour's requiring his disciples to baptize all men into faith in this power? And here again I would ask, suppose we were required to draw up a short synopsis of Christian doctrine, — after speaking of God as the universal, impartial, benignant Parent of his children, after speaking of Jesus Christ as one who had taught new and striking truths respecting God and duty, what should we be likely to mention next? Would not the third and last point be *the evidence* that this personage was what he pretended to be? By adding this last to the other two specifications should we not have covered the whole ground, and have presented a brief but perfect synopsis of Christian truth? Should we not, after mentioning these three things, first, that God is our Father, second, that Jesus is his Son, and third, that all that he said and performed was done by the miraculous power of God, should we not have repeated the three grand features of our religion, and those on which Jesus Christ more than on any others insisted? Accordingly we find that Christ mentioned this belief in his miraculous power next. He frequently referred to his miracles as proof of his divine mission. "The works that I do, I do not of myself, the Father that sent me, he doeth the works." "Believe me for my works' sake." But the Jews said he was mad, that he had a demon, that he did these things by Beelzebub the prince of the devils. This was that sin against the Holy Ghost which our Lord said should not be forgiven. The sin was their ascribing to the agency of an evil spirit what he did by the power of God. If we look, too, to the heathen world, we find that the Gentiles would attribute his miracles, as they did those of Moses, to magic, and would regard him as one of the many impostors who would establish a false religion by pretending to work miracles. In opposition to these opinions both of the Jews and the Gentiles, our Lord requires his disciples to baptize all into a belief that he was, not merely a teacher, but a teacher from God. Converts to his religion were to believe that he did come forth from God, that God

illuminated his mind, poured out his spirit upon him without measure, and to be convinced that never man spake as he did, and that no man could do the things which he did unless God was with him. The miracles which our Lord wrought were thus to be regarded as sanctions of all that he said and did. They were proofs of the divinity of his mission, and pledges of the fulfilment of his promises.

Such, then, are my views of the interpretation of this formulary of Christian baptism. It is full of important meaning, every word of it is of weighty significance. It was customary in all baptisms to baptize into a profession of faith in some person or doctrine. Our Lord says, "Go ye and teach all nations," not the Jews only, but all, baptizing them into a belief, in the one, universal, benignant Father of mankind, into a belief of Jesus as his Son, the Messiah, the teacher of everlasting life, into a belief in the miraculous power of God, as exercised by Jesus to confirm his mission and to sanction his truth. If I should be asked for the arguments by which I would support the interpretation now given, I could only reply that, beyond presenting in stronger light the various points already alluded to, I have no argument at all. For it has seemed to me all the while, that I have been narrating simple matters of fact; and instead of building up any theory of my own, or proposing any far-fetched interpretation, I have been engaged in the humbler and better work of stating over in other language our Lord's brief and concise command. I know that many find in this text a distinct statement of a doctrine to which they profess great attachment, but which we concur in disbelieving. On the point whether this text states that doctrine or not, I should have but this simple question to propose, Which is most likely, that our Lord should require his disciples to baptize converts to believe in a doctrine which he never taught, — for the passage where our Lord teaches the distinct personality of the Holy Ghost has as yet never been found, — or that he should require them to baptize men to a faith in the three leading doctrines in his religion, doctrines which he considered as the characteristic features of his system, as is evident from his uniform anxiety to state and illustrate them?

I have dwelt at considerable length upon this subject, because I deem it important. It is important that we should know the significance of language Christ has taught us to use in the solemn rite of his appointment. It is important to know to what faith we are baptized, whom we covenant to follow, and what

we covenant to believe. It is important for us to feel, when we offer either ourselves or our children in baptism, that no language is used which throws distrust upon the precious truths to which we have attained, but that the words we repeat are a lucid statement and a confirmation, strong as the authority of Jesus, of the simple faith we prize. What is this formulary of baptism but a creed, a creed not written in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but made by our Master, even Christ? And if we believe in it with all our hearts, whatever others may call us, Christ will own us as his followers, and will pledge to us his everlasting favour. We would be ready, then, to profess before many witnesses our *belief*, our *joyful, hearty* belief, of the simple but quickening truths which Jesus has here required; and we would rejoice to set apart to these truths those whose religious education has been committed to our hands. We would receive these truths which he has taught us, and doubt not he will never reject us for refusing to mingle with them what he has not required.

H. A. Miles.

Manufactures in their Influence upon Pauperism.

No. II.

LARGE MANUFACTURING ESTABLISHMENTS.

In a former article we expressed the opinion that small manufacturing establishments are upon the whole beneficial to a community. As to those factories upon the largest plan, we do not feel warranted from facts to say that even they contribute to pauperism. Both now and at all former periods, the agricultural districts of England are beyond comparison more burdened with pauperism than manufacturing districts. We hear much of the distress of workmen at Manchester, and the impossibility of their procuring work; but all these accounts are greatly exaggerated. Political and party motives so distort facts that we hardly know what is true or what false. That wretchedness exists there on a large scale, and wretchedness arising from poverty, is most true. Still, no class of labourers in England have so constant employment and so good pay as the opera-

tives in large factories. Fewer fluctuations in business affect them, and their wages are quite sufficient for a comfortable support. The mobs and riots, which we usually attribute to the distress of want, have their origin in moral causes, almost independently of the means of support.

It must, however, be remembered that England was but recently changed into a manufacturing country. Little more than thirty years ago she was an agricultural state. There has not yet been time for a full developement of all the moral influences which arise from the change. If these influences are allowed to go on unrestrained, we believe that they will ultimately have a most unhappy effect, not only upon the moral character of the people, but, indirectly, upon pauperism; at the same time making it more common, more degrading, and more distressing.

In our remarks upon this topic, we would confine ourselves to influences naturally belonging to large manufacturing towns. We shall not intentionally touch upon those which happen to exist in particular parts of a particular country. The insulated facts which we may chance to mention must be considered as illustrations rather than arguments. We put no confidence in political arithmetic or political facts. Statements, without all the details connected with them, whether drawn from statistical tables or from any other source of information, are not merely useless, but dangerous. As generally written, it is hard to tell whether history, "teaching by example," has done more good or harm to the cause of true philosophy. The remarks which we would offer have been prepared with much caution and distrust, and they are founded more upon the nature of large manufacturing establishments, than upon the many important facts that have fallen within our notice. The inference that we would draw from our examination is, that while these establishments have been favourable rather than injurious to legal pauperism, they have yet contributed sadly to the worst evils with which poverty is cursed — bad health and bad morals.

1. *Health.* "At thirty," says an experienced witness, who had long been employed in a cotton factory in Manchester, "both men and women *were* as I am, at sixty; at forty, they are obliged to wear glasses; and if they got up to fifty it was only an odd one or two." Here is perhaps exaggeration. What say the bills of mortality? According to them the average mortality for England in 1780 was one in forty; in 1810, one in fifty-three; in 1820, one in fifty-seven; and in 1833, one

in sixty; but, upon examining more particularly, we see that in Middlesex the annual deaths are one in forty-seven; in Lancashire, one in fifty-five; while in agricultural districts they are one in sixty-three, one in seventy, and in some places only one in eighty-four. These tables may not be exact; but all allowance being made for errors, it is certain that in manufacturing, as in other large towns, the mortality is much greater than in rural districts.

We must not, however, judge from this alone. Places in which the mortality is greatest are not *therefore* the most unhealthy. On the contrary, many chronic disorders tend rather to protract than to cut short the term of life. The constitution upon which, in their milder forms, they have fixed their hold, is weakened, and thereby rendered less obnoxious to violent disorders. The fountain of life flows in one continued stream of bitterness; but it still flows on. Factories are especially fitted to produce this sort of complaints. Their uninterrupted employment, their high temperature, their close atmosphere, all conspire to destroy the vigour of the constitution, at the same time that they leave sufficient strength to carry on the work of vitality and to perform the monotonous labours of the place.

Fatal consumptions are not common. Coughs and asthmatic affections are the prevailing disorders. "On the whole it may be said," says a writer who had looked carefully into the subject, "that the class of manufacturers [in England] engaged in mill-labour exhibit but few well defined diseases; but that nearly the entire number are victims to a train of irregular morbid actions, chiefly indicated by disturbances in the functions of the digestive apparatus, with their consequent effects upon the nervous system; producing melancholy, extreme mental irritability, and great exhaustion, and that few acute maladies exist among them; that their existence, though passed in one long disease, does not seem shortened. Few among them can be said to enjoy good health; all are more or less ailing."

Let us look a step farther. What must be the offspring of such parents? If constitutional disorders and infirmities are hereditary, what must the race become in the second, third, and fourth generation? We cannot find that the mortality among children is so great in any city of Europe as in Manchester; where nearly one half of all that are born die before they are two years old. And the ratio is increasing. Thirty years ago, five years after birth was the period within which

one half of all who were brought into the world had left it; and this notwithstanding the general enlarged average of human life.

2. *Morals.* From the health to the morals of these people the transition is easy. Both partake of the same general characteristics; both are alike languishing and sickly; always diseased; but generally free from violent disorders. Relief from the distressing exhaustion of their daily toil must be sought by them. But the polluted atmosphere of a crowded manufacturing town cannot restore them; the damp, crowded, ill-furnished apartments of their private dwellings cannot restore them; still, relief must be had, and the ale-house is the only resort. Stimulating liquors, whether tea, coffee, or ardent spirits, are among no class so much depended upon and resorted to as among mill-labourers, and unfortunately the high price of their labour allows them the indulgence. Yet intemperance does not here, as in other employments, lead directly to pauperism. The enfeebled frame is still able to wait upon machines, which require little strength and no moral responsibility.

We have said that the health and morals of mill-labourers partake of the same general characteristics. It is a singular fact that the number of mercenary crimes increase with the progress of civilization, while crimes of violence decrease in about the same ratio. Thus in England (1826) the proportion of mercenary crimes to the whole population is seven times as great as in Spain, the most ignorant and degraded of all countries pretending to civilization, and more than twice as great as in France. But more than this, mercenary crimes seem multiplied by manufactures. In the North of France (Charles Dupin is our authority) the increase of manufactures has been marked by the increase of mercenary crimes. So with the manufacturing portions of Ireland, and, yet more remarkably, with the manufacturing parts of England. This disproportion will appear much greater, if we consider that crimes of violence are far more easily detected than crimes against property, and that fewer, therefore, will escape unpunished.

What does this show respecting the character of manufacturing people in large towns? Crimes of violence are usually the effect of passion. They do not argue, more especially in the rude stages of society, any considerable depravity of character. But when theft, fraud, and other mercenary crimes thrive, and crimes of violence become less frequent, it

is plain that the passions are kept under; but that there is a spirit of cold-blooded calculation, a degradation, a depravity of character, to which society in its early stages is a stranger. Crimes of violence more outrage the feelings; but it may well be doubted whether they so much endanger the well-being of the social system.

But how happens it that a manufacturing population should be particularly exposed to these evils? Are they accidental, or necessarily woven into the constitution of manufacturing towns? To us they seem to be a necessary part of these establishments. They are the effect of causes which are inseparable from overgrown manufacturing towns.

The bad health that we have just mentioned will, to those who are in the habit of considering the influences of our animal upon our higher nature, appear to be a demoralizing agent of no common power. But to enumerate other influences. Large numbers are crowded together into hot rooms. In many parts of factories the operatives live in a temperature unnaturally hot; and medical men have undertaken to say that children who are brought up in these hot houses have in their temperament the precocious flames of those who are born within the tropics. Their animal passions are as premature and as strong. We would not lay great stress on this point; we believe that it has been overstated by ardent writers. Still, the heated temperature of the rooms, and the circumstance that both sexes* are crowded together into them, may be one of the reasons why one twelfth of the children born in Manchester are illegitimate.

Another evil, of still greater magnitude, and which is inseparable from all factories, is the unremitted, interminable attention which the operatives are obliged to pay to their machinery. "The tediousness and everlasting sameness of the work prey upon their spirits" and break down their minds. "The day a man becomes a slave, he loses half his soul." But the labourers in a factory are slaves, not to men, to beings endowed like themselves with a moral capacity, acting upon their own responsibility, able to change, or to mitigate the rigour of their laws,—slaves, not to such beings, but to matter, to brute, insensate matter; bound, without all hope of release, to wait upon and to watch the eternal motions of a water-wheel

*The sexes are not thus mingled in this country. Male labour is, in consequence of the demand for it among farmers, little employed in manufactures, except to make machinery and to superintend the work. But were we a manufacturing people it would not be so.

or a steam-engine; in every sense of the word, slaves to their mighty antagonist, "which toils with a pertinacity and unvarying continuance" that tire the strongest heart.

J. H. M.

Jesus a Divine Teacher of Morals.

Some Christians of the present day appear to regard the work of a moral teacher as the lowest part of Christ's office; and some have been so presumptuous as to assert that if he had no higher office he might as well never have been sent, as there have lived and yet live uninspired men fully competent to it. To this statement I cannot assent; for where human teachers have been in the main correct, they have often given license to single sins; where they have been unexceptionable, their systems have been adapted to the circumstances of but a single class of men or a single nation, and human teachers have not authority to enforce their precepts. A moral teacher from God was needed that he might give us a perfect system of morals, one adapted to all men, and one promulgated and sanctioned with sufficient authority. I will therefore endeavour, in this and the following communications, to show the need in which mankind stood of having a teacher sent from God.

In the present article I wish to prove that a divine moral teacher was needed in order that a perfectly pure system of morals might be promulgated.

It is often said by unbelievers that Christ brought forward no new precepts; that every principle which he recommends for the government of the heart and life may be found in the writings of the Greek and Oriental philosophers. I have no disposition to dispute the fact. It ought to be cheerfully conceded by those who regard the God whose inspiration gave man understanding and the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ as one and the same Being. Nor does this concession derogate from the importance of Christ's mission. The elements of organic and animal existence were imbedded in chaos, when the earth was without form and void and darkness was upon the face of the deep; but it was

not until the Spirit of God had brooded over the abyss, that shape or order or beauty appeared. And thus the disjointed elements of gospel morality had gleamed forth from time to time amidst the gross moral darkness which covered the earth; but it was not until he came upon whom the spirit was poured forth without measure, that the symmetry of a perfect whole presented itself. Before Christ appeared, there were numerous moral systems, some of them nearly, but none altogether, faultless. One system required strict honesty, disinterested benevolence and patriotism, but left its disciples at liberty to sunder at pleasure the bonds of domestic society. Another forbade anger, fraud, and all social offences, but permitted the unreserved indulgence of appetite. Another cherished every military virtue, but permitted unbounded selfishness and avarice. Another echoed the maxim of the corrupt Jews: "Thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy." Another required its disciple to be strictly virtuous while he lived, but permitted him to terminate his life as soon as he was weary of it. And thus among the exemplars, nay, among the teachers of virtue in the ancient heathen world, there were the sensual, the avaricious, the proud, the unforgiving, the suicide, — men who, weighed in the balance of the sanctuary, would be light as air, — men who were less than the least in the kingdom of heaven. And the adherents of any particular system of morals were generally more distinguished by the vice or vices which that system permitted, than by the virtues which it enjoined. Thus in the Spartan code of morals, courage was recognised as the greatest of virtues, while selfishness and avarice were deemed honourable rather than disgraceful. The names of some Spartan cowards are preserved on record; but history does not furnish us with a single instance of disinterestedness in that nation, from the days of Lycurgus, the founder of their polity, to the period of its dissolution. Indeed, a system which in common discourse is styled nearly perfect may be and often is as deleterious to the moral character as one confessedly very imperfect. A country liable to inundation is as much in danger, when one single foot of the barrier which defends it is thrown down, as it would be if the whole were made level with the ground; and thus a moral code which leaves a single avenue for vice is as dangerous as one which makes no distinction between vice and virtue.

Let us suppose such a system. Let us suppose one which, unexceptionable in every other regard, says nothing against

the love of money. Its disciple has his affections as yet unoccupied by any object of exclusive attachment. He may perhaps scorn to avail himself of this defect. If so, he will look within and above him, will love God and cherish the elements of spiritual life, will become a truly virtuous man. But he may perhaps reason thus with himself: "Here are some of my fellow-men bound down to the indulgence of appetite; others, reckless of the claims of justice and humanity, rushing breathless in the pursuit of glory; others finding their highest pleasure in acts of tyranny and usurpation. From all these sources of enjoyment I have debarred myself. But money, which answers so important, so essential a purpose in the economy of life, even my severe lawgiver allows me unrestrained liberty to seek and use; and its pursuit and enjoyment shall therefore fill the time and engross the affections which those about me devote to forbidden objects." He will thus commence the pursuit of gain, at first with moderation and in perfect accordance with the discharge of all required duties; but all the passions of man are progressive, and Mammon will soon become the god of his soul, crowding out of his mind his religious and social duties, or making the discharge of them purely mechanical; and when this is once the case, the man is as truly and thoroughly a bad man as if he had many besetting sins. Indeed, he is more hopelessly depraved; for the concentration of his powers and affections upon a single object gives that object a power over him, which a distracted mind could never confer upon one or all of several unworthy objects of interest. — Thus we see that a *nearly* perfect system will not do. We want a perfect law. We want to have the floodgates shut fast against iniquity. We want not a single aperture, however small, left for its entrance; for through even the smallest it may inundate the soul. When Christ began to teach, the human mind had been striving for four thousand years to plan a perfect moral code. It had shown itself inadequate to the work. The task was above man. Man needed a teacher sent from God. It would have been as easy for an uninspired teacher to have raised Lazarus from the dead as to have delivered the sermon on the mount. Thus have I proved that a divine teacher was needed to promulgate a perfect system of morals.

A. P. Peabody.

The Prophecy of the Destruction of Jerusalem.

The gift of prophecy, when the possession of it is attested, is the highest evidence of a divine mission. He who claims to be a teacher sent from God must appeal to some higher testimony, in support of such a claim, than to the mere excellence of his doctrines, however remarkable that may be. If he would do more than excite the interest and fix the attention of some of the more reflecting among those to whom he asserts the divinity of his mission, and aspire to the general reception to which his claims if supported will entitle him, he must appeal to miracles, wrought either for him or by him. These miracles may be either miracles of *power*, or miracles of *knowledge*. The latter include the gift of prophecy. To those who live in an age when a divine revelation is communicated by the mouth of an inspired teacher, the exhibition of miraculous power, by reversions of the order of nature, and interferences in the known course of events, which their senses would afford them the means of investigating, would be at once an indispensable requisite and a satisfactory occasion of belief. The mere prediction of a future event, however great might be the sagacity employed in studying the passions of the human heart or the intricate operation of successive causes and effects, might prove the teacher to be possessed of wonderful penetration and the most consummate wisdom; but till the prophecy has been attested by its fulfilment, this wisdom would by few, if any, be exalted above worldly skill. But the farther we advance from the time when the miraculous power was exhibited, the acknowledgment of such occurrences and the reception of the truths which they establish depend upon further investigation and an examination of evidence which at first was unnecessary.

We must search for many arguments before we assent to the truth of statements where so high an interest is involved as to make indifference or carelessness not only unauthorized but even inexcusable. That the miraculous events recorded in the Scriptures, particularly in those of the New Testament, stand upon such evidence as at once sets them above all cavil or possibility of dispute, has often been fairly and ably demonstrated. This is a subject with which we have at present no concern. We merely wish to mark the distinction, that while the proof required to establish the actual occur-

rence of miraculous events necessarily increases from age to age, nothing of this need be said in relation to that kind of evidence for a divine mission which is offered in the pronouncement and fulfilment of prophecy. Once establish the fact that an event was predicted, and that it was subsequently accomplished in agreement with the particular specifications, which history makes a very easy matter, record the result, and the evidence will be as satisfactory in one century as in another.

We might here speak of the sublime truths which are made known to us in the very nature and intention of prophecy, — of the indisputable evidence which it affords of the existence of an almighty Sovereign, of his overruling providence, of the interest which he takes in the concerns of man, of his omniscience, of our absolute dependence upon him, and our obligation to venerate and obey him. But we wish to notice here the fulfilment of a prophecy which is unsurpassed by any other in the explicitness of detail which attended its utterance, and the remarkable, the awful lesson conveyed in its minute accomplishment, — we mean the Prophecy of the Destruction of Jerusalem.

The gift of prophecy being, as we have said, so high a proof of a divine mission, we should expect that it would be appealed to by all who have aspired to such a title, whether they have deserved it or not. Such we find to have been the case. Pagans had their oracles, augurs, and soothsayers, and modern idolaters have their necromancers and diviners. Impostures have been as frequent here as in the pretensions to miraculous power, inasmuch as the facilities for deception are equally numerous in both cases. Credulity may be imposed upon, the victims of the deception may be made unwittingly to contribute to their own errors, and natural means may be so used, especially where ignorance and superstition prevail, as to appear supernatural, as well in pretensions to the power of predicting future events, as to that of performing miraculous acts. That such pretensions should be made is what we should have suspected beforehand. Some men have been led to reject all claims both to the power of working miracles and that of prophesying, solely on the ground of these impositions. If they followed this principle in all the concerns of life they would see its absurdity. It is well here always to remember that if there were no genuine power ever exerted there never would have been pretensions to it; as the circulation of counterfeit notes acknowledges the real value of such as

they are intended to imitate. Many impostors have enjoyed for a longer or shorter time the character of prophets, who had no claim whatever to such a title. This fact should make us watchful in guarding against deception, and lead us to apply every necessary test. If we do this we may rest assured we shall not be deceived. Every false pretence to the prophetic spirit, if it have succeeded at all, will be found to have done so from one of the three following causes: either the event was not actually foretold in such explicit language as forbade all danger of mistake; or, if foretold in such a manner, was of such a nature that nothing more than human wisdom was needed to foresee it; or, lastly, though it may have been predicted in plain terms, yet was not accomplished according to the prophecy. History affords us examples where claims to the power of prophesying have been admitted, which have yet been proved to be false, from one, or more, of these deficiencies. The three conditions which we have given afford us a fair test by which we may estimate the truth or falsehood of a claim to the power of prophesying. We would apply them to the prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem which was made by our Saviour to his disciples and the Jews.

I. Our Saviour foretold the destruction of the city and temple of Jerusalem, in language which could not be mistaken.

II. The event which he predicted was such as with the attendant circumstances no human power could have foreseen.

III. The prediction was actually and circumstantially fulfilled.

I. Our Saviour foretold the destruction of the city and temple of Jerusalem, in language which could not be mistaken.

1. In the first place, we find the most explicit language in relation to this event in each of the first three gospels, (Matthew xxiv. Mark xiii. Luke xxi.) But before any stress can be laid upon this argument, it must be proved that the records which contain this language were written before the event. This is a fact which we establish in the same manner with regard to these books as we do with regard to any other, namely, by consulting the uniform opinion of those who had the means of knowing the truth, and by the absence of any contrary testimony. The temple was burnt on the tenth of July, A. D. 70. The prediction must, then, have been uttered at least thirty-seven years before the event, and was recorded by the Evangelists when they composed their Gospels. It is evident, then,

if we can show the existence of either of the Gospels in which it is contained, prior to the event, that we establish our point. Take, for instance, Luke's Gospel; of this the Acts of the Apostles is a continuation by the same author. (Acts i. 1.) In this history we find a hint to guide us in settling the time of its composition. The last verse but one leaves Paul at Rome between the years sixty-three and sixty-five. This was in all probability the period at which the history was composed; and as his Gospel was written previously, the prediction was recorded by Luke at least six years before it was fulfilled. Besides this, though critics have differed about the precise year of the publication of the first three Gospels, they have all *concurred* in assigning them a date prior to the destruction of Jerusalem. The latest date which has been given to them is the year sixty-four; by some writers of authority twenty years earlier. There is, then, every reason to believe that the prophecy was recorded previous to its fulfilment. The language, too, cannot be mistaken. Circumstances are foretold, which would precede, accompany, and follow the catastrophe. The time of the event was given within certain limits. "*That generation* was not to pass away, till all was fulfilled." Many minute particulars, which we hardly notice in the records, were clearly specified. Of these we shall again speak, when we come to the fulfilment.

2. But it is not only in explicit statements that the calamities impending upon the Jews are foretold; we find another very strong argument that the prediction was actually made in the fact that our Saviour frequently refers to the event in distant allusions. The Evangelists have recorded many of his sayings in which we now observe a direct reference to the fate of the Jewish nation and religion, though the writers do not seem to have been aware of them when they composed their Gospels. We might select numerous passages from each of the first three Gospels, where, in the parables which the Saviour uttered, the rebukes which he laid upon the Pharisees, and, more than all, in his instructions concerning the nature of his kingdom and the purposes of his mission, he not only infers, but takes for granted, that the Jewish system was to be superseded; and that, too, in a manner which should show that he who abolished it was no other than the Omnipotent One, who for his own wise purposes had established it.

3. We found a third argument for the reality of the prediction upon the honesty and candour of the historians who recorded it. The veracity of the Evangelists is established in

the most satisfactory manner, from the nature of their office, the absence of every possible motive for deception, their open and simple manner of stating what bears against themselves, such as the Saviour's rebukes of their want of faith and blindness of heart, and their readiness to seal the truth of their doctrines with their blood. "Cunning," says Paley, "was no quality of theirs;" and he forcibly argues that if they were recording the prediction subsequently to its fulfilment, they would have dropped some hint either knowingly or carelessly respecting its completion, such as designating the time more accurately, mentioning the name of the general or emperor who commanded, or noting the nation and number of the enemy. St. Luke, after speaking of the prediction of a famine by Agabus (Acts xi. 28), says, "Which came to pass in the days of Claudius Cæsar." Numberless instances occurred where the Evangelists, if honest men, and recording the prediction after its fulfilment, could hardly have failed to drop some hint of the fact. If, however, they were dishonest historians, and wished to create a belief that they were writing before the event, they would have endeavoured in some covert manner to inform their readers that they were writing with more honest intentions. But besides the absence of any and every argument by which the slightest suspicion can be brought upon the historians, a remarkable circumstance, arising from the relation contained in the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth chapters of Matthew, puts this matter beyond all dispute. Christ there speaks of the time and manner in which his kingdom would be established by the overthrow of Judaïsm, but there is mixed with this account much that evidently had no reference to Jerusalem or the Jewish faith in particular, and is understood by all critics of authority as applying to the final judgment of the world. It will appear evident to anyone who reads the discourse of our Saviour as given by Matthew, that the Evangelist considered the whole as having reference to the same event, namely, the coming of the Son of Man, which would take place when, by the destruction of the temple, the Jewish system would be formally abolished and Christianity established in its stead. If, therefore, he had written after the event, when he would have found that but a part of the discourse related to it, his language would have been more explicit.* The more closely we examine this fact,

* There has been a difference of opinion concerning the meaning and reference of the parables contained in Matthew xxiv. and xxv. Some commentators making the whole refer to the destruction of Jerusalem, oth-

the more clear it will appear that the Evangelist was relating a discourse of which he did not then comprehend the precise bearing, and would not till the event had shown it more plainly.

4. Another argument in support of our position, that the prediction of our Saviour was plainly stated and circulated before the event, is found in the fact that none of the Christians suffered in the calamities. The passages which contain the prediction abound in exhortations to the first disciples to save themselves by an early flight. The signal that was to warn them was the appearance of images which the law strictly forbade, namely, the Roman eagles, "the abomination which rendered desolate," standing in the Holy Place, by which was meant not only the temple, but any part of Judea.* They were then commanded to save themselves by instant flight; not to delay long enough to take with them the most necessary articles of life. The ruin predicted was to be general though not total, and no security was offered to those who should slight the warning. Now these predictions were either known to the early Christians, or they were not. If they were not, it would have been idle in anyone, who wrote after the event, to say that such warnings had been given, which the event would have disproved. It is evident likewise if the Christians acted up to the commands, and followed the admonitions there given, that they must really have possessed them. We know that they did act in this manner, that at the first approach of danger, they fled; why were they so much wiser than their countrymen? We have no reason to suppose that a single Christian suffered in the conflict. They are supposed to have left before the siege began. Some went to Pella, as mentioned by Eusebius, a city on the other side

---

ers to the final judgment of the world, while a third class have maintained with more plausibility that a part refers to one event, and a part to the other, but have been at a loss to find the point of transition. The difficulty is removed by a more exact translation of the 31st verse of chap. xxv. We may suppose the account, thus far, to refer to the establishment of Christianity by the subversion of Judaism, and after this, to the character of Christianity, and the manner in which, under its direction, the rewards and punishments of the judgment-day would be distributed. Thus we are told of the circumstances which should attend upon the establishment of Christianity, and (v. 31) of the state of things when it is established — "When the Son of Man *shall have come* . . . . . then, after that, thenceforward, men shall be judged by the laws of Christianity" — which are there made known.

* Lardner, *Jew. Test.* Vol. vi. p. 408.

of Jordan; others might have gone elsewhere into remote countries where they could obtain a settlement.*

But though the Christians had all remained at Jerusalem, and been involved in the common fate, we must still admit that they possessed these warnings, unless we wish to suppose a most extended scheme of imposture and trickery, of which there is not the slightest appearance. We have every proof which the nature of the case admits, that the woe was denounced earnestly and frequently. The warning was heard both by friends and enemies. The former, we know, heeded it; the latter were exasperated by it, and were satisfied only by the blood of him who had dared to speak so presumptuously, as they thought it, of the people and the religion which the Almighty had designated as his own. The knowledge of the prediction was faithfully circulated by the apostles among the several communities. The allusions to it in the Epistles are very numerous.† Such were the expectations excited that the fulfilment of the prophecy was undoubtedly looked upon by many who wavered in their choice as the test of the truth of the religion whose claims were to be thus supported. Many were looking anxiously for the appearance of the slightest signs that the great and terrible day was drawing nigh. If the prediction had not been so explicitly made to the apostles that it would have been impossible for them to doubt, it is hardly to be supposed that they would have risked their credit and the cause of their religion, for which they offered themselves, to any sacrifice, on such a dubious issue.

We might enlarge upon these points, and multiply the arguments which offer themselves so abundantly to establish the reality of the prediction, but those we have already given must be sufficient to satisfy any reasonable mind that upon this point the evidence is conclusive. The words were uttered which foretold the ruin of Jerusalem; they were recorded before the event, with a precision and circumstantiality which forbade everything like duplicity or deception.

II. The event predicted was such as with the attendant circumstances no merely human power could have foreseen.

What was it which our Saviour foretold? It was that before that generation had passed away the Deity would

* Matth. xxiv. 15, 16. Mark xiii. 14. Luke xxi. 20.

† Heb. x. 25; 1 Thess. v. 2; 2 Thess. ii. 2; 1 Timothy vi. 14; James v. 7, 8; 1 Peter iv. 7, &c.

desert the temple where he had so long been worshipped,—that it should be laid level with the ground,—that the whole city should be wasted and destroyed,—that the system, which the misinterpreted voice of prophecy had declared to be as everlasting as the hills, was to pass away,—that sacrifices and ceremonies were no longer to be accepted,—and that that prayer would ascend nearest to the throne of God which came through the lips of the despised Christians, and rose in the name of him who came out of Galilee. This was but the result which was foretold. Ere the time for its completion arrived the whole world was to be agitated. Earthquakes, wars, famines, and pestilences were to mark the change in the counsels of Jehovah. False Christs and false prophets were to arise. The appearance was not, like the twinkling of a star, to be confined to a single spot, but would be rather like the lightning which lighteth up the heavens from east to west. All these were to be preceded and accompanied by the extension of the name and kingdom of him in whose behalf the mighty revolution was to take place.

Such was the result foretold, and such were some of the unusual signs which were to attend and follow it. Can it be said that human sagacity was sufficient to foresee these effects, and that uninspired lips could have foretold them? Let it be remembered that the prediction was uttered thirty-seven years before its fulfilment, and that it was not merely a single event, depending upon the combined influence of causes known to be at work, which was foretold, but an extended and mighty revolution, such as the world never before or since beheld; where the causes and effects were alike above the reach of human wisdom to discover or to comprehend. Many of the incidents which accompanied the final catastrophe were such as did not necessarily have the most remote connexion with it, and could not have been foreseen by human wisdom even before their immediate occurrence, yet these were made known with equal distinctness. No one will presume to say that human penetration was all that was needed, especially when the circumstances are duly considered. It has been said that misfortune had long threatened the Jews, and that the storm which had been gathering at a distance must soon have broken over their heads. Even if this assertion were fully true, it would do little to support the opinion, that, though the calamities of the Jews had been multiplying, human wisdom could trace the issue in that long train of events specified in the prediction. But we cannot admit the assertion. Jose-

phus, who lived in that age, and was a man of much penetration, affords satisfactory proof, in the history which he has left us, that nothing could have been farther from his mind than a suspicion that the Jewish religion was approaching to its end. It is true that even in the times of the Saviour various causes were at work, which afterwards contributed to the accomplishment of the prediction; yet these causes, so far from portending the destruction of Jerusalem, did not even furnish the slightest expectation for the wars. Besides all this, the situation of the Jews at the time of the Saviour's prediction was much more favourable to their prosperity than it was before or after it. The government of Pilate was mild and easy. The Jews were allowed many privileges. His successors, too, were comparatively virtuous in their administration, and it was not till the time of Gessius Florus, the last governor, that their grievances became intolerable. The impending calamity, then, was not only uncertain, but improbable, at the time of its prediction. It is worthy of remark that the soldiers who first commenced hostilities, and were the prime cause of those disturbances which ended in such an unexpected catastrophe, had been once ordered to depart from their garrison by the emperor, who subsequently permitted their stay at their earnest supplication. It was only by their repeated cruelties that the Jews were impelled to resistance; and had they gone as they had been ordered, their place would have been supplied by less sanguinary guards, and the catastrophe which they brought about, deferred for a long time at least, if not wholly averted. Josephus, speaking of these soldiers, says, "These are the persons who occasioned the dreadful calamities which befel the Jews, and laid, during the government of Florus, the foundation of those troubles which afterwards broke out into an open war; on which account they were banished from the province by order of Vespasian."* The character of the emperor, too, who planned the siege of Jerusalem, and accomplished, though, as will afterwards be seen, unwillingly, the doom which had been pronounced upon it, was by no means such as to favour the outrages which were committed against the Jews. Titus was the mildest prince who ever swayed the Roman sceptre; and the absence of his father, Vespasian, in Italy, placed the conduct of the war in Judea in his own hands. Though all we can gather from history of

* Joseph. *Antiq.* B. xix. c. 9, p. 2.

his character and intentions satisfies us, that he would not have permitted the devastation, which in the issue he was unable to prevent, this is not the whole proof we have of the unpremeditated fate to which Jerusalem was devoted. We know, likewise, that he interfered frequently, at different periods of the siege, to request of the Jews that they would make terms of capitulation, and thus preserve their temple and nation. That the wishes of the leader who was to accomplish the prediction should be opposed to its fulfilment, is no small proof of the wisdom of him who uttered it.

But by far the most satisfactory proof which can be given for the divinity of that wisdom which could predict the ruin of Jerusalem and the accompanying events is found in the trifling nature of the circumstance which gave birth to the sedition. The account as given by Josephus * is to this effect: — In a narrow and close street in Cæsarea the Jews had a synagogue. As the people were all assembled here on the Sabbath, "A spiteful Cæsarean set an earthen vessel before the door, with a sacrifice of birds upon it." This mockery of their most holy rite irritated the Jews extremely; and though some of the wisest among them were for seeking redress by other means, yet the majority had recourse to blows, for which the Cæsareans were ready to return added insult. Thus a common street broil, at first confined to a few of the more turbulent on both sides, was to be the commencement of those hostilities which should end only in the utter and total subversion of the Jewish state. Every exertion was made by those in authority to allay the tumult. But insult was heaped upon insult. Twelve of the chief men who went to Florus, to petition for a redress of their grievances, were ordered to be seized and bound. Though the Jews were highly exasperated at this act, they endeavoured to suppress their indignation, till they were driven to open though late resistance by the perfidy of Florus, who cast all manner of indignities upon them. By his permission the houses were pillaged, the nobility whipped and crucified, and women in the most critical circumstances were tortured in an aggravated manner. Six hundred and thirty Jews were murdered in one day. After such occurrences, the ruin of Jerusalem might seem possible; but how disproportionate were such effects to the cause!

Yet the prediction of the final issue forms but a small

* *Wars of the Jews*, B. II. chap. xiv.

part of the inspired Teacher's prophetic declaration. Of the minor circumstances of the case we shall presently say more. We have stated the origin of the trouble, which, however slight in itself, was the real commencement of the long train of disasters which immediately overwhelmed the Jewish nation. The most searching human wisdom could not have foreseen it a day before it took place. It should increase the interest with which we study this evidence which the Saviour offered of his divine origin, when we see how insignificant a cause the Almighty selected to bring about so great an end. How wonderfully in this instance were the foolish things of the world chosen to confound the wise, and the weak things of the world to confound the mighty! Never was there a greater disproportion between cause and effect. It is no characteristic of human wisdom, when most exalted, to pay so little regard to the philosophy of nature. So entirely were the misfortunes of the Jews to be ascribed, under God, to the unjust and oppressive measures taken by Florus, that it will be admitted on all hands, had anyone, whether wise or foolish, pretended to predicate anything concerning the issue, there is every probability that the disgrace of Florus with the Roman powers and his removal from office would have been the general prophecy. But it was not so. He was permitted to convert a private quarrel into a nation's destruction, and to complete, with fearful accuracy, a prediction that could have been uttered only by a wisdom which was divine.

III. We come now to the third test which we wished to apply to the prophecy, namely, that the prediction was actually and circumstantially fulfilled.

It might seem useless to enlarge upon this point; but if as mere matter of history the inquiry be interesting, of how much more importance is it when we consider its value as an evidence of our religion! an evidence which the most artful infidelity cannot gainsay, nor the coolest indifference resist. We would wish, then, briefly to enumerate the most remarkable points of agreement which present themselves between the prediction and the fulfilment, namely, in the circumstances preceding, accompanying, and closing the occurrence.*

As if to give every opportunity to the Jews to avoid the

* Lardner has done this with great copiousness in the sixth volume of his Complete Works, pp. 400 - 475.

fate which impended over their national institutions, and to mitigate, as much as possible, the misfortunes of the sufferers, by lessening their numbers, an opportunity of escape was offered to all who would embrace Christianity. The Saviour promised that, before the end arrived, his gospel should be preached in all parts of the world, or the Roman empire. (Matth. xxiv. 14.) We know that this was fulfilled, from the number of churches which soon sprang up under the teachings of the apostles, and the places indicated by the superscriptions of the Epistles, as well as the intentions of the four Evangelists in writing their histories for different communities. Christ, then, gives to his disciples many infallible signs, by which they might mark the "beginning of sorrows." Impostors, false Christs, and false prophets were to arise (Matth. xxiv. 5); a prediction strikingly verified by the large number of enthusiasts and deceivers who arose and contributed very much to distract and divide the already seditious Jews. Of these a long catalogue is furnished by Josephus. The disciples were likewise informed that owing to the severe persecutions they would be called to endure (Matth. xxix. 9, 10, 12,) many would fall from among them, the early victims of violence, of coldness, or the want of faith and zeal. The coming event was likewise to be known by extraordinary national divisions. (Matth. xxiv. 6, 7.) Wars and rumours of wars were to be frequent, nations and kingdoms were to contend with each other. That this prediction was fulfilled appears from the numerous troubles which fill the history of the times. Josephus speaks of different commotions among the Jews, especially at a Passover, when twenty thousand Jews perished; likewise at Samaria, Cæsarea, all over Syria, Scythopolis, Alexandria, Damascus, &c. Heathen historians, though unknowingly, bear the most striking testimony to the truth of this prediction. Commotions of nature likewise were to portend the coming calamity. The whole course of nature would seem to be disturbed, while pestilences and famines accompanied, (Matth. xxiv. 7.) A famine in Judea is mentioned Acts xi. 25–30, which is likewise noticed by Eusebius. A famine in Italy is related by Dion Cassius, another by Tacitus, and both by Eusebius. There was a pestilence in Babylon in the year 40, a great mortality at Rome, A. D. 65, and many others in various parts of the Roman empire. Tacitus speaks of an earthquake at Rome, another at Apanea, another in Asia, when Laodicea, Hierapolis, and Colosse were entirely destroyed, and another

in Campania, A. D. 62. These and similar prophecies, so fearfully fulfilled, were thus minutely specified by the Saviour, as signs to those who should believe upon him. Jerusalem was not yet besieged, and there was still time for flight. Warned by such fearful sights, which might well presage coming sorrows, and which could not well be misunderstood, those who had embraced the gospel were to make haste to flee from the devoted city. The tender expressions which marked the Saviour's language, in regard to those whose flight might be accidentally encumbered, gave them good reason to suppose that when the city was once attacked there would be no escape. The time was fixed in "that generation," the appearance of the Roman eagles in the city was the signal, and, as we observed before, there is every reason to suppose that the Christians faithfully obeyed it.

We have no room to trace the progress of the siege of Jerusalem, or to describe the changing fortunes which left the issue very doubtful till it was close at hand. The commencement of hostilities has been already noted. The enemy do not seem to have been aware of the real strength of the Jews, or to have foreseen the obstinate courage with which they would contend for their deliverance. Often, during the protracted war, fortune seemed to favour the Jews, and to promise success to their endeavours. Had not the city within been divided by three factious leaders, which removed everything like unanimity and concert in their counsels, the Roman army would have felt the blow more severely than it did. As it was, the enemy was thrice repulsed with great loss; they were obliged to abandon their original intention of taking the city by storm, and content themselves with closely blockading it, and reducing it by famine. Terms of capitulation were often offered, and as often resolutely refused. The day came when the enemies of Jerusalem, "cast a trench about her, and compassed her around, and kept her in on every side." (Luke xix. 43.) Even when the outer fortifications were destroyed and the enemy had entered into the city, the strong towers within would still have bid defiance to their attacks and cost them further toil and blood, had not famine obliged the Jews to desert them. Well might Titus exclaim, as he admired their strength, "We have certainly had God for our helper in this war! it is God who has ejected the Jews out of these fortifications!" Never was a battle fought in which was displayed more resolute courage, more disinterested devotion, or so many instances of heroic self-sacrifice

for the public good. In every advantage gained by the enemy, and in every discomfiture of the Jews, we are forced to discern the hand of a mysterious power. If we discover it throughout the contest, it is doubly remarkable in the closing scene, to which we hasten.

When the disciples of our Saviour were admiring the grandeur of the temple, particularly the size of the stones of which it was built, he told them that the time was not far distant, when it should be levelled with the ground, and its foundations be obliterated. The manner in which this part of the prediction was fulfilled imparts to our subject much of its thrilling interest, while it affords the most convincing proof of the divinity of that wisdom which foretold it. It was not till after the overthrow of the quadruple wall which enclosed the city, and the demolition of the towers and fortresses which had so long bid defiance to the enemy, that the attention of either party was called to the temple. The daily sacrifices had till this been scrupulously performed. It was at their cessation that the Jews were called to the temple. Josephus says they were induced to flock thither by the promises of a false prophet, who declared that the Almighty would there deliver them. The nearer and the darker their fate appeared, the more bright was the hope that the long-expected one would arise and save. As a last resource, the Jews betook themselves to the sacred precincts of the temple, for the double purpose of availing themselves of its defences and of preventing the pollution with which the hand or foot of an enemy would defile its sacred recesses. Perhaps they were still encouraged by the hope that though they had by their crimes and cruelties forfeited all claim for protection from their national Deity, he would still interpose to save the hallowed edifice where his chosen people had met to pay their vows and exalt his praises, and upon whose altars daily sacrifices had been offered to his glory. They may even have waited with assured confidence that he who had interposed his strong arm to overthrow the kings of Egypt and Assyria would, ere it was yet too late, come forth in the terrors of the lightning or the earthquake. It does not seem to have entered into their thoughts that the splendid structure was doomed to destruction. They trusted much, likewise, to the known dread of the enemy. The Roman soldiers hesitated to enter even the courts or the cloister. Josephus says they shuddered at it as profanation. The emperor himself, either from respect to its reputed sanctity, or admiration of its splendid magnificence, had resolved

to save it, and had issued strict orders to that effect. When he found that the Jews had betaken themselves to its protection, and that his victory could be extended and completed only by their defeat, he remonstrated with them, and promised them if they would come forth from its shelter and defend themselves the temple should go unharmed. "You have put a barrier," he said, "to prevent strangers from polluting your temple. This the Romans have always respected; we have allowed you to put to death all who violated its precincts. Yet ye defile it yourselves with blood and carnage. I call on your God, I call on my whole army, I call on the Jews who are with me, I call on yourselves, to witness that I do not force you to this crime. Come forth and fight in any other place, and no Roman shall violate your sacred edifice." The doom of the temple was sealed. The fire which destroyed it was lighted by a Roman soldier, who, when Titus had retired to rest, acting without orders, and against the express commands of the emperor, mounted upon the shoulders of one of his companions and threw a blazing torch into an open door. Even when the flames had spread around, so as to make the ruin certain, Titus rushed among them, commanding and entreating the soldiers to use every effort to stay them. But their insatiable hatred of the enemy, the ardour of battle, and their eagerness to seize the plunder, overcame their respect for the emperor; and they revelled among the splendours of the intricate and numerous apartments, till the tottering ruin of so much magnificence compelled them to retreat and leave the temple to its fate. Ten thousand Jews, men, women, and children, perished in its flames.

With this consummation, all hope of deliverance was abandoned. The Almighty had allowed the house where he had so long deigned to dwell, to be violated and destroyed: he had cast them off from his protection, and they were no longer the favourites of Heaven. But their calamities stopped not here. It seemed, for a time, that not only their existence as a nation was to be closed, but as if the very name of Jew was to be consigned to the pages of history, and numbered with the things which once were. All the remaining strongholds of the Jews, throughout the Roman empire, were attacked and demolished. Hostilities were continued long after the means and inclination for resistance were lost. If the fearful signs which portended the destruction of the city were fit presages of the downfall of the

temple, this last event may well be considered as but the beginning of those indescribable woes with which Judea was afterwards afflicted. Where mercy was asked it was never given, unless in the permission of being slaves to the meanest of the Roman people, or the necessity of being chained as labourers in the mines or galleys. The glory had departed from Israel, and had departed forever.

Thus, in all its fearful minuteness, was fulfilled the prophecy of our Saviour. As involving the destiny of those who were once the favoured people of God, it was most worthy of being pronounced by the lips of him whose day was declared before their election was made, and at whose coming the father of their race had in long prospect rejoiced. The Almighty had elected the Jews. He likewise commissioned the Saviour to fix an end to their privileges.

We are led, in conclusion, to inquire why such scenes of desolation and blood were selected as the signs of the coming of the Son of Man? Why were the national privileges of the Jews thus fearfully closed? And why was the establishment of a religion of peace made to depend upon the previous occurrence of all the atrocities of war? If we may presume to inquire into the counsels of God, Paul has undoubtedly given us the cause of the calamities which he knew were to come upon the Jews. (1 Thess. ii. 15, 16.) We need not say that the Almighty brought directly upon them such direful punishments; but we may say that he did not interfere to prevent them. They were the natural consequences of their own obstinacy and hardness of heart. They had corrupted the law which had been given them, and refused to be convinced by the highest proof which the Saviour could give them of the divinity of his mission; they had slighted all his warnings, and condemned one who never harmed them to an ignominious and cruel death. They had filled up the measure of the iniquity of their fathers, and scoffed at the holiest precepts. Thus they had forfeited every claim upon the Divine protection, and richly deserved every calamity that fell upon them; for in enduring them they were but repaying that innocent blood which they had willingly brought upon themselves and their children.

It was fit, likewise, that as the hand of the Almighty had been employed in erecting the temple it should also be present at its overthrow. If a new religion was to be established under his name, it was but right that his protection should

be visibly withdrawn from the old. As long as the temple remained upon its foundation it would still be considered the place where men ought to worship; and though the continual flame might cease to burn upon its altar, the hope within their breasts would never die. Nothing but its total overthrow would have proved to them the absence of the Deity. When the violent hands of the soldiery had been permitted to pollute it, to plunder its ornaments, and even to defile with their presence the Holy of Holies, where none but the chief priest might enter, the Jews would call it an awful sacrilege. But when its walls were levelled with the ground they could say nothing to encourage themselves or each other. Such total, entire ruin was necessary, and it was permitted. The altar would no longer flame with its costly incense. Its sacred steps and pavement had been drenched with the blood of its last fearful sacrifice, and it was no longer the accepted shrine of Jehovah. Upon the very spot where he had so long been worshipped, amid the slaughtered bodies of his priests, and surrounded by the smoking ruins of the temple, the victorious Pagans offered their sacrifices of joy to "the unknown God." The golden table and candlestick, the censers, the silver trumpets, and the Book of the Law, which had been kept in the temple, were carried to Rome, to grace the triumph that Vespasian made for his son Titus. If the chief design of the Almighty, in the destruction which he permitted, had been to show that rites and ceremonies would no longer receive his approbation, the total ruin of everything upon which the ritual observances of the Jews depended, would have fully done this.

Since the destruction of Jerusalem there has not lived a man who could rightly claim the title of a Jew. The scattered remnant of the race may still meet in their synagogues, may still read the law in the original tongue, and with their faces turned to Jerusalem may pray for the redemption of Israel. But the hour has past. The Redeemer has already come. They will wait in vain for a new deliverer. The Messiah has come; and his is "the only name given under heaven among men whereby we can be saved."

G. E. Ellis.

The Religion of Intelligent Men.

By intelligent men I mean not simply those who have been trained up at our colleges and universities, but those also who, in the various circumstances in which they have been placed, have to a considerable degree cultivated their minds, and increased their knowledge; whose talents and attainments qualify them for important stations in society, and whose endowments and situation in life give them the power to exert a great influence on their fellow-men. By intelligent men I mean those persons in the community, who usually account themselves the more intelligent, and are accounted so by others. My object in this paper is, to consider what attention such persons more generally pay to religion; what evidence they give of an earnest and steady piety, and of a devout and Christian life.

There are some to be included in this class, who openly reject and zealously oppose Christianity, who claim the wisdom to know that all religion is but priestcraft, superstition, and folly, and that God is but the creature of imagination. Such men are engaged about religion; but it is to destroy its authority and influence. They are eager to make proselytes to their infidelity or atheism; as though belief in a God, a Providence, in a Saviour, and a future life, were the chief obstacle to human happiness.

But leaving those who are the avowed enemies to Christianity, let us speak of those who, on the whole, choose to be known as its friends. They show an outward respect for religious institutions; they may contribute to their support, they may frequently or occasionally attend public worship, they may read the Bible and religious books. But how many of them seem to be stupid about their spiritual condition, regardless of the dangers which threaten them, insensible to the worth of their souls, and to their need of preparation for death! They may speak of the evils of infidelity, the absurdity of atheism, the reasonableness of Christianity; but how many of them leave us to doubt whether they have ever felt the power or been convinced of the importance of the Gospel as a means of salvation! They like to compare opposing systems of theology, to read the arguments that can be brought for and against difficult and disputed doctrines. They love to study controversial divinity, to listen to popular and elo-

quent preachers. They love to engage in religious conversation themselves, when opinions, errors, and extravagancies are the topics of discourse. But vital, practical godliness, a religion of the heart and life, is what many of them have no relish for, nor feel any concern about. They are but little more affected by reading the Scriptures than they would be by reading the heathen mythology. The truths of the gospel make no solemn impression on their hearts; and they feel not their obligations to obey its precepts. They often in various ways give us to understand that they consider it as an act of condescension in them to regard religion. They imagine themselves too wise to submit to its instruction, and too independent to be restrained by its laws and authority. It would be cowardice in them to fear God, and disgrace to humble themselves before him, and superstition to pray to him.

How many of those who pass for the more intelligent, and who in various ways are important members of society, are men who make no pretentions to piety! Many would confess to you that they were not pious, and the confession would make them betray no apparent signs of either shame or remorse. They continue, year after year, cold and careless about their eternal welfare. How many of them treat with indifference the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's supper! as though no mention was made of them in the New Testament. Penitence for sin, prayer, gratitude, praise, openly professing their faith in Christ, and following his example, are duties which with all their learning they have never discovered, or they have had the boldness to disregard them. They appear to feel no anxiety about their condition and prospects. They know they are not complying with the gospel terms of pardon and salvation, and yet they continue unconcerned or fearless. Their respectable station in society and their intelligence almost cuts them off from the privilege of being admonished and instructed by those around them. The more humble and ignorant seldom venture to remind them of religion, supposing their exhortations would be fruitless, if not offensive; their minister feels not the freedom to urge them to attend to religion as he does those in humbler circumstances. He fears they will account him obtrusive, and he thinks their knowledge excuses him for his silence and neglect.

Perhaps some of my readers may sustain the character I have been attempting to describe. I will suppose that one

such, at least, will glance his eye over these pages. To such an one I would make an earnest, solemn appeal. You are an intelligent man. I will suppose your outward deportment decent and correct. You are not profane and indelicate in your language, you are not intemperate or licentious, you abstain from what the world calls vices, you pass for what is called an industrious, sober, honest, and amiable man. You are constant in your attendance on public worship. You generously and cheerfully aid in support of religious institutions. You take an active part in promoting the interests of the society to which you belong. You respect and esteem your pastor. You are earnest that what you have adopted as Christian truth should prevail and gain the ascendancy over what you call error. You love to talk about religion, to remove objections and prejudices against your views of it, and to persuade others to embrace the doctrines which you advocate. But if you are an intelligent man, you know that many who pass for such do not go so far as I have supposed you do in regard to religion. Many fall much below you, and, compared with you, treat the subject with almost total indifference and neglect. But you are not one of these. By many who have but a slight acquaintance with you, or who take a partial view of your character, you may be thought altogether a Christian even now. But can you not perceive that one may easily show your zeal and liberality, without having much love to God or a just sense of the importance of religion? You may do all this to gain popularity, and to promote your temporal interests. I cannot tell by what motives you are actuated, nor do I presume to judge or to know your heart. But I would affectionately entreat you to examine yourself, whether you be in the faith. My fear is that you are still a stranger to yourself and to religion. If you are already pious, you will know how to pardon my solicitude; and if you are not, I trust you will neither be disgusted nor grieved at my friendly expostulation. The question is not, whether you sustain what is commonly called a good moral character; but whether you are in desire, purpose, heart, and life a Christian? one who with some degree of propriety can be called a follower and disciple of Jesus? You know the meaning of the word disciple. Have you received Jesus as your teacher, your master, your Saviour, and the mediator between God and man? Have you ever felt your obligations to yield obedience to his instructions, and to submit to his authority? Have you with gratitude owned

him to be your Saviour? Have you ever felt your need of that truth, grace, and mercy, which he reveals and offers to you? Have you ever complied with those conditions on which you are promised pardon, acceptance, and eternal life? I need not tell *you* what sin is. Have you ever viewed yourself as a sinner, and exercised that repentance which the gospel requires? Something is said in Scripture about being born again, born of the spirit, and created anew in Christ Jesus. On comparing your dispositions and conduct with the requirements of the gospel, can you consider yourself as thus spiritually born and created anew? Something is said about taking up the cross, and confessing Christ before men. What sacrifices do you make; what self-denial do you practise? O, my friend, have you ever felt any godly sorrow for sin? and has that sorrow produced reformation of life, peace of conscience, and joy of heart? "If ye love me, keep my commandments," saith the Lord. Do you thus love him? You choose to be known among the friends of religion. But is it your sincere desire and constant endeavour to be acknowledged by Christ as his friend? What are your religious feelings and habits? Are you accustomed to the duties of watchfulness, prayer, reading the Scriptures, and devout meditation? Perhaps you are the master of a family, and a father. Is your house a Bethel? Are you a priest and a prophet to those under your roof, — a priest, to approach the domestic altar and offer the morning and evening sacrifice; a prophet, to read the sacred pages and to enforce their truths and precepts by earnest exhortations? You are desirous to have your views of religion spread; but what kindles that desire in your breast? What need have others of religion? How is it important to them? You desire the progress and triumph of your opinions; but is it with a view to secure the prevalence of holiness and virtue? Do you look upon your fellow-men as immortal and accountable beings; as needing the support and consolation of the gospel in this world, and its hopes and promises to render them happy in the world to come? Have you with an eye of pity regarded the moral and spiritual condition of those living in error and sin? Have you accounted religion the one thing needful to give light to the mind, joy to the heart, peace to the conscience, and rest and salvation to the soul? Have you given your heart to God; are you devoted to Christ? Have you been baptized? Have you made a profession of religion? Do you let your light shine before men?

I do not ask you to what denomination you belong. I trust you belong to none that would reject you for your having a pious heart and living a holy life.

You are an intelligent man; qualified, by your station and attainments, for rendering important services to the cause of religion and virtue. *Where much is given much will be required.* Consider what you can do by your example and influence to advance the Redeemer's kingdom.

Will you smile at my earnestness? Will you treat these inquiries and expostulations with indifference? I trust you will not. Consider how soon you must depart out of this world. I have supposed that it will be a comfort to you in a dying hour, if you can take such a retrospective view of your life as a sincere, pious, and intelligent Christian might. In this world men are often respected for their talents, their learning, their station, and their wealth. But in the world to which we are hastening, and at the tribunal before which we must appear, we shall be measured by our virtue and piety; and he will be accounted the wise man, who has had the wisdom to fear God and the understanding to depart from evil. To be known of God with approbation, to be owned by Christ in the presence of his Father and the holy angels, are honours worthy of our most ardent desires and of our most diligent endeavours. Such honours may we seek, and so seek that we shall obtain them!

J. Farr.

Salvation by Jesus.

Jesus is called our Saviour. If any one fact be clearly taught in the New Testament, it is that we are saved by him, and that, except in his name, there is, there can be, no salvation. In what sense is this true? It is an important question. I propose to answer it briefly, but as satisfactorily as I can.

If we would comprehend the New-Testament writers, we must call back the ages which have passed away since they wrote, and bring up before us, in all their freshness, the scenes in which they acted, the circumstances which formed their minds and gave to their language its peculiarities. They were men of their own times. They wrote for their contem-

poraries, and chiefly for their own countrymen. They indeed uttered grand and glorious truths, truths which belong to all ages, to all countries, to all individuals; but these truths immeasurably surpassed their comprehension. They uttered them with but a vague consciousness of their import. They saw only Jews and Gentiles. They saw only an immediate remedy, or rather a substitute for the worn-out system of Judaism, and for heathen superstition and idolatry. They never considered Christianity as a universal religion; they never thought of laying down maxims and uttering oracles for all coming ages. Hence it is, in almost every sentence of their writings, you stumble upon something local, or temporary, suggested by circumstances then existing, intended to meet objections, to obviate difficulties, which were then encountered, but which have been long since forgotten. There is in these writers a double current of thought, if I may use the expression, proceeding from two and dissimilar sources, one from their own minds, the other from God. The first is seen in the form and colouring of their language, in the local and temporary objects to which they apparently devoted themselves; the other is seen in the sublime thought, in the universal truth, in the divine reason, which every moment breaks out in spite of themselves, in spite of all the narrowness of their views and of their Jewish prejudices. We must always bear this in mind when we read the New Testament, and be careful to distinguish what belongs to the writer, to his age, to his country, to the circumstances by which he was influenced, from what belongs to God, and equally to all ages, to all countries, to all individuals, and to all circumstances.

We will go back to Judea; we will place ourselves near the temple in the holy city, a short time before its destruction by the Roman army, where we can have a full view of the tribes as they repair thither to worship. Who are these tribes? What are their pretensions? Let us listen, a moment, to the conversation between this Jew and this believer in Christ.

Believer. The time is set. This city is soon to be numbered with those that were and are not. The temple-worship will soon cease. The institutions of Moses have had their day, and they and our nation will pass away.

Jew. Prophet evil! how darest thou utter such predictions? God hath chosen Jacob and made Israel his habitation.

Has he not sworn to be our God, to be our Protector, to be our Saviour, and has he not promised that every nation that will not obey us and submit to our law shall be destroyed?

Believer. I tell you the day of your law is ended. It is old and ready to vanish away.

Jew. Our law? God gave that law on Mount Sinai by the hand of Moses to our fathers, to be an everlasting covenant between him and his people Israel. How sayest thou that it is old and ready to vanish away?

Believer. That law is imperfect —

Jew. Hold, wretch! Thou blasphemest! The law imperfect? God himself gave it, and promised us life if we obeyed it.

Believer. No matter. Your law is imperfect. It commands sacrifices and offerings, which are of no avail. The blood of bulls and of goats cannot wash out the deep stains of sin, cannot purge the conscience and make it alive towards God and void of offence. The law enjoining sacrifices and offerings, outward rites and ceremonies, is necessarily imperfect. Its righteousness is of a low kind, and insufficient. I may repair to Jerusalem statedly, my three times a year, to worship, I may keep all the appointed fasts and feasts, make all the appointed oblations, submit to all the prescribed ablutions and penances, and still be a bad man; my heart may still meditate murder and my hands be red with crime. The thing intended by the law may be good, but to rest in its positive, external duties is death. You may keep it, but it will answer not your purpose; for by its deeds, that is by the duties which it enjoins, shall no flesh be justified.

Jew. There may be truth in this; but if we discard the law, whither shall we go? What substitute do you propose for the law of Moses?

Believer. Jesus, the Christ, in whom we should trust; for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved. Give up Moses, and believe in Christ; abandon your law with its long, fatiguing ritual, and embrace the gospel, and be translated from the kingdom of Mosaic darkness into the kingdom of God's dear Son, where all is light and life.

Jew. But who is this Jesus? What concern can he have with my salvation? Or how can I find safety in him?

Believer. Your law is imperfect. Its righteousness is of a low kind. For although one should keep the whole law, we might still inquire whether he be a good or a bad man.

You want, then, a righteousness of a kind different from your legal righteousness. Your legal justice is not true moral justice. This true moral justice, spiritual righteousness, Moses did not give you. Some of the prophets beheld a few faint gleams of it, and foretold that it would be ushered in with all the glory of the noonday sun; but it was not ushered in till Jesus was born. He is the representative of the true kind of righteousness, and he has exemplified in his own life the perfection which, if you and I have it, will save us, and without which there is no salvation for us.

JEW. But why is it necessary that we should have that kind of righteousness of which Jesus is the representative?

BELIEVER. Simply because we cannot be justified in the sight of God unless we are just, cannot be approved by him unless we are truly righteous; and there is no true justice, righteousness, or holiness, except that which Jesus had, and of which he is the representative.

JEW. It is well. But will it be enough for me to have that righteousness of Christ? May I then neglect the Mosaic law and not be guilty?

BELIEVER. Yes. When you become a Christian, you are translated into a new order of ideas, into a new spiritual kingdom; have, as it were, a new country, and are no longer in bondage to the laws of the one you have abandoned. Your law is insufficient. Its righteousness cannot save you. Christ is all-sufficient. His righteousness, and that alone, will save you.

The mystery is solved. The apostles were Jews and combatted the Jewish religion. They were to the Jews infidels and innovators. They condemned the old law, and sought to destroy its dominion. They proposed a new system of moral righteousness, one founded on different principles, appealing to an entirely different order of ideas. Of this new system Jesus was the representative, its personification, and hence it bears his name. And, as it was only by possessing this kind of righteousness anyone could be saved, it was said, and said truly, "There is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved."

Controversy may end. We all agree as it respects Christ's righteousness. Let us be assured that we cannot be saved without it. Let us be assured we must have it,—not imputed to us, as some have wildly dreamed,—but in us, wrought out in us, by our own love and obedience. We must have

Christ's righteousness, by being righteous as he was righteous, by having in us the same mind or spirit that was in him, by being what he was, "sons of God and joint heirs with him." Then are we saved by Jesus, — not by him personally, — but because we possess that righteousness of which he is the representative. Let us all aim to obtain it, and that without delay. O. A. Brownson.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Poems. By S. G. Bulfinch. Charleston, 1834. pp. 108. 18mo.

This little volume contains a variety of poems, written in the brief intervals of leisure in an arduous profession. Their literary merits are various; all are respectable, and some breathe a high strain of poetical feeling. They give evidence of an accomplished mind and a practised hand. The tone of moral and devotional feeling is of the purest and best kind. The language generally has an agreeable flow, and sometimes rises into truly vigorous expression. Like all literary efforts produced in moments snatched from laborious duties in another line of occupation, they sometimes betray haste in composition, languor in conception, and want of finished execution. The imperious demands of rhyme sometimes require the insertion of the weaker instead of the stronger word, the inappropriate instead of the appropriate epithet, and, in fact, the unpoetical instead of the poetical expression. Making all these deductions, much remains to gratify the taste and excite the better feelings of the reader.

A part of the volume is taken up with translations, chiefly from Schiller, one of the purest poets of modern times. The two or three from Körner are done with great spirit and fidelity to the original, and all of them show a just appreciation of German idiom, in thought and expression, and a scholarlike mastery over German poetry.

We insert the poem on "New England," as a favourable specimen of Mr. Bulfinch's powers, and the reply to it by "Ma-

rion," to show the noble spirit of patriotism that is yet unextinguished in the South.

We merely remark that the epithets in the expressions, "harp-strung lyre" and "burning-hearted youth," of "Marion," do not seem in good taste.

"NEW ENGLAND.

"Oh! who upon his lips could lay
The seal of caution strong,
And calmly give the slander way
That does his country wrong?
Who can restrain the burning word,
The fearless glance of youth,
When each indignant thought is stirred
To witness to the truth?

"New England! glorious, native land!
When false to thee I prove,
Then palsied be my faithless hand,
My lips forget to move!
When thou art challenged, shall my voice
In thy good cause forbear?
No! be a nobler part my choice,
Here, — ever, — everywhere.

"Home of the good, the brave, the wise,
Bold youth and beauty bright,
The sun, as on his course he hies,
Beholds no lovelier sight.
Italia's vales with perfume glow
From every flowery tree,
But ne'er those lovely valleys know
The breath of Liberty.

"Bright beams the sun on Syria's plains,
Where ancient prophets trod,
And held, in nature's forest fanes,
High converse with their God.
But holier are the hills that bind
Thy stormy ocean shore,
For there the sacred human mind
Knows its own strength once more.

"There, in the cottage and the hall,
As bursts the morning ray,
The hymn of praise ascends from all
To Him who gives the day.
There, as the evening sun declines,
They join in harmless glee;
On all the beam of pleasure shines,
For all alike are free.

"Yet if I love thee, native land!
Is the bright South less dear?
Can I not prize the lofty band
Of generous spirits here?

Souls warm with honour's sacred fire!
  Hearts true in friendship known!
Fearless I strike the patriot lyre —
  Its spirit is your own.

"At the request of a friend, the preceding lines were inserted, with the signature of 'HAROLD,' in one of the Augusta papers. The next number of the same gazette contained the following noble verses in reply.

"'TO 'HAROLD.'

"'Child of those hills whose lofty heights
  Their answering thunders woke,
When, struggling for her injured rights,
  Our infant nation spoke, —
Those barriers to the stormy sea,
Where men, resolving to be free,
  First spurned the tyrant's yoke, —
Can Southern hearts forget that spot?
Child of those hills! believe it not.

"'Shame to the man who would forget
  New-England's noble stand,
When Britain's bannered columns met
  To desolate our land.
No! by the blood she freely poured, —
By Warren's spirit, — Putnam's sword, —
  We love New England yet!
Those hills! that height! tomb of the brave!
Our martyred freemen's earliest grave!

"'The selfish for a time may rule,
  Fierce passions bear the sway;
The traitor knave, the busy fool,
  Alike may have their day: —
Our Union Banner, still, untorn,
Shall proudly on the winds be borne,
  Reflecting every ray.
No! not a star our fathers set
Shall fall from that bright coronet.

"'Child of those hills! thy harp-strung lyre
  Swells with a lofty strain; —
O! let its tones of patriot fire
  Breathe on our souls again!
Its spirit bears a tale of truth
To every burning-hearted youth,
  From mountain to the main;
Thy native hills, though cold they be,
Are peopled by the brave and free.

"'MARION.'"

pp. 70 – 74.

1. *Mr. Dunlap's Speech in the Municipal Court, in Defence of Abner Kneeland on an Indictment for Blasphemy.*
2. *Arguments of the Attorney of the Commonwealth in the Trials of Abner Kneeland for Blasphemy.*

The former of these publications was printed and circulated first, and the latter was published as an antidote to what it was feared would be its injurious effects, "at the request of some Christians of various denominations."

We are satisfied that it will prove a sufficient antidote, not only to the laboured defence of Mr. Kneeland, but also to all those poisonous mixtures of irreligion, sensuality, and ignorance which the infidels are now so busy in concocting. The most ill-humoured critic could wish for no better subject, on which to exhaust his spleen and satire, than Mr. Dunlap's Speech would afford him. It is a collection of all the unfortunate persecutions and violent controversies that disfigure the history of Christianity, —of which, it will certainly be no disparagement to Mr. Dunlap, who has chosen a different sphere in which to exercise his powers, to say, that he has evidently been a very superficial reader. We must, however, do him the justice to say, that he disapproves of all these unholy contentions; for so we construe the purpose of his attempt to free himself from the opprobrium of undertaking the defence, and the numerous flowery epithets which he bestows upon pure Christianity. Yet we must be allowed to pronounce his speech a very poor production. What it may be in a legal point of view is no concern of ours; but as a piece of connected history, of sound arguments and satisfactory demonstration, we should think it fully within the intellectual powers of the defendant himself. It would be a very easy matter to expose the sophistry of Mr. Dunlap's reasoning, where he aspires to such a thing; and, by divesting his ideas of their interminable rigmarole of repetitions, flummery, and bombast, to point out many perverted and inconsistent statements, besides several downright violations of true history. But we are happily free from the necessity of such an attempt; as the badness of the cause in which he permitted himself to labour would account for still greater deficiencies in the means necessary to support it.

Of Mr. Parker's argument we can speak in terms of unqualified approbation. We rejoice that it has been made public, both on account of the clear views which are contained in it in regard to the proper signification of religious tolerance, and the real character of that system whose advocate was on trial for blasphemy. Mr. Parker has well defined the meaning of certain terms necessary to be employed in the case, which it was the policy of the defendant's counsel to confuse and render senseless. He has shown most satisfactorily that blasphemy has a meaning,

that religious faith is not hypocrisy, and that our laws, which insure to everyone the purest freedom in holding and maintaining those views which his individual reason and conscience approve, are very far from allowing to any man the liberty of deriding the opinions of another, and by obscene and vulgar blasphemy mocking his dearest and holiest hopes.

Besides the value of Mr. Parker's publication on these points, we deem it of particular interest as setting forth the true character of the existing infidelity in our neighbourhood. We fear that people are too much inclined to look upon the infidels among us as merely indifferent to religious views and principles, instead of regarding them, as they really are, a band of ignorant and deluded, not to say immoral, men, discontented with all the existing principles upon which the social system is maintained, and eager to bring about a total change in all the institutions of society. "Blasphemy," says Mr. Parker, "is but one part of the system which Fanny Wright has introduced among us." The inevitable consquences which would ensue, were her sentiments, and those of her associates, to prevail among us, are well worthy the attention of those who are obliged to witness the progress of irreligion in our country. This pamphlet will be particularly interesting to those who live at a distance from us, but who are beginning to find among them the advocates of "Free Inquiry." We wish it could have a wide circulation in the West. We copy the closing paragraph.

"And now, Gentlemen, I leave you to do your duty. I hope I have done mine. If open, gross, palpable, and indecent blasphemy, and all the consequences of the Fanny-Wright system, — atheism, community of property, unlimited lasciviousness, adultery, and the thousand evils of infidelity, receive no check, the reproach will not fall on me. If marriages are dissolved, prostitution made easy and safe, moral and religious restraints removed, property invaded, and the foundations of society broken up, and property made common, and universal mischief and misery ensue, the fault will not lie on me. But you must answer for your part in bringing up that train of incalculable evils which may be visited on your posterity to the third and fourth generations. You must answer for it to your fellow-citizens, your wives, children, and relations, to mankind, to your country, and to your God. Look, then, with care, Gentlemen, to your great responsibility in this trial, to your duty, and to your verdict. Take care, this day, that you offend not God, nor injure man, that you violate not the law and the constitution, that your children rise not up in judgment against you, and that you avoid the maledictions of the world."

"The jury did not all agree. Eleven of them agreed on a verdict of *guilty* in ten minutes. A personal and political friend of the defendant's counsel was the dissentient juror. He did not regularly belong on that jury, and was put there by Mr. Dunlap's exertions."

CORRESPONDENCE AND INTELLIGENCE.

A LETTER TO THE REV. ADIN BALLOU ON THE SUBJECT OF EXCHANGES BETWEEN THE RESTORATIONISTS AND UNITARIANS.

Harvard, May 14, 1834.

DEAR SIR,

YOUR patience must have been wearied, but I hope it has not been exhausted by my long delay. I have, hitherto, been in no favourable situation for answering your letter which appeared in "The Messenger" last July. And even now I have not the leisure and freedom from other cares which I need in order to give the various subjects introduced into your letter the attention which they deserve. But I choose rather to speak now, as well as I can, than to be silent any longer. I shall, by leave of Providence, write you a number of short letters, in reply to your very long and very friendly one. I would have accepted your kind offer, and had them published in "The Messenger"; but the editor of "The Unitarian" consenting that they should appear in his journal, I thought there was a propriety in my using that channel of communication.

I am "willing," my dear Sir, "to meet" you "in a friendly discussion of the principal points which hinder the fellowship of the Restorationists with the Unitarian denomination"; though I am but poorly qualified for such an undertaking. I shall address you with freedom and plainness, and, I hope also, in the spirit of meekness and brotherly love. But remember, I answer you as a private individual, not as the organ or representative of the denomination to which I belong. Perhaps I may put in a stronger claim to disinterestedness in treating this subject now, on account of my having the care of no parish.

I am aware that many of the clergymen of your denomination desire to have fellowship and ministerial intercourse with those who are Unitarians. I know, also, that a number of Unitarians do exchange with Restorationists. I believe that the Unitarians generally do not denounce you as infidels, nor deny you the Christian name. Not a few of them agree with you in rejecting the doctrine of eternal punishment. And many, no doubt, considering the duration of future misery as not clearly defined, insist only, in their preaching, on the certainty of a future righteous retribution, thinking it the part of prudence and meekness not to be positive on either side of a question which, in their view, is not explicitly decided by Scripture. You know that the Orthodox often charge us with being not simply Restorationists, but Universalists. I suspect that, as a denomination, we are not so frequent in the language of terror and threatening, nor in denunciations of everlasting woe to the sinner, as the Orthodox are. We oftener appeal to men's hopes than to their fears. And while we endeavour to enliven the conscience and touch the heart, we strive to keep the moral and rational powers in their healthy exercise. As far as my knowledge extends, Restorationists are better satisfied with our preaching than the Orthodox are. There is also a great deal of good feeling and sympathy between the Unitarians and Restorationists. They more generally seem to exhibit toward each other pacific and charitable dispositions. But still they exist as two distinct denominations. The Unitarians have not as yet consented to adopt the creed and assume the name of the Restorationists; nor have the Restorationists given up their distinctive name and peculiar doctrine and joined themselves to the Uni-

tarian denomination. Hence, in many of our efforts to build up the cause of Christian truth and liberty, we act as two separate associations. Each gives the preference to books for religious instruction composed by those of his own denomination, and to preachers whose faith more fully accords with his own. It is a fact that we differ in doctrine; we form two distinct, organized bodies of Christians; and while these things continue, I know not that we can reasonably expect a complete union and fellowship. Many Unitarians, no doubt, consider your distinguishing doctrine an error, and are unwilling, therefore, to encourage it. The Restorationists account it a glorious and important truth, which ought to be stated and defended. Many of your denomination would be dissatisfied with a preacher who rejected and opposed the doctrine of a final restoration; and many Unitarians would be similarly affected by hearing that doctrine advocated. I presume that no Unitarian church would exclude a Restorationist, nor refuse to welcome him to the ordinances of baptism and the Lord's supper.

But you wish to be welcomed to every Unitarian pulpit as a preacher. I know, my friend, there is a disagreeable feeling awakened in the heart of one who loves religion, and desires to communicate its glad tidings and holy influences to others and to enjoy Christian intercourse with all pious persons, whenever he is denied this privilege. We have, both of us, had many trials of this kind. The Orthodox have often treated us both as strangers to religion and enemies to God. I think I have learned in the school of Christ to submit to such trials with some degree of patience. I try to remember that others have feelings, and have a right to their opinions, as well as I. I blame not the Orthodox clergyman for refusing to exchange with me, nor his society for being unwilling to hear me. If they would manifest their dissent from my faith in such ways only, I would rest satisfied.

You know it is but a few years since you separated from the Universalists and assumed the name of Restorationists. Your denomination appears to be strongly opposed to the Universalists; but many Unitarians have not yet sufficiently considered or understood what a wide difference there is between your sentiments and those of the sect from which you seceded; and, if they exchange with you, they may fear you will embrace that opportunity to indoctrinate your hearers in a faith which they deem unsound. For myself, I know not of any instance, where your ministers have done so, when they have exchanged with Unitarians. And would the two denominations mutually and generally agree on all such occasions to avoid those things about which they differed, I should have no objection to this ministerial intercourse. I have often heard Baptists preach to Pœdobaptist societies, but in every instance they were silent about their peculiarities. I should be willing to exchange with a pious minister of any sect, if his conscience would let him omit his peculiar doctrines; and unless he would, I would rather not exchange with him. I know not what you will say to this; I hope you will approve it. I have endeavoured to pursue this course myself, and have thought it proper and commendable. And it seems to me that the more this course is followed by Christians of different denominations, the more fellowship will they have with each other.

But in regard to exchanges generally, even with those of our own faith, the longer I live, the more unfavourably I think of them. They have been the occasion of much evil. No doubt good has been mixed with the evil, but I have thought that the evil preponderated. By these frequent exchanges the people become fastidious in their taste and fond of excitement and novelty. They grow discontented with their own pastor, if he is not much above mediocrity; and if he is, they are displeased with those who are not. If a society have a very popular preacher, they wish to have him exchange with none but such; if they have one of ordinary gifts, they are dissatisfied if he do not often exchange with the more talented. Many clergymen have been made to know, by the smallness of their au-

ence when hey preached at home, and the large number they were told were out when another occupied their desk, how low they stood in the estimation of their own flock. So long as a minister has the care of a society, it is important to his usefulness and their benefit that he should have their respect, confidence, and esteem. If he is faithful to his duty, he can generally edify them better than those who sustain not this near relation to them. He is better acquainted with their characters, attainments, circumstances, and wants. If he is often absent from his people on the Sabbath, many precious opportunities to confirm the wavering, to comfort the sorrowful, to direct the inquirer, to encourage the seriously disposed, and to fix or deepen good impressions are lost. If we desire the spiritual improvement of those belonging to our society, we shall strive to be with them as much as we can, to prevent their moral declension and to help them onward in the path of wisdom and virtue. Often the very day we were absent was the very day when we could have rendered an essential service to the cause of religion and to our people, had we been at home. I confess it seems strange to me that both ministers and people pay so little attention to this subject. I suspect it is partly owing to these frequent exchanges that the people have such unsettled, vague, and indistinct notions about religion, and that they remain so ignorant of the Bible. They never receive any systematic course of religious instruction. They go to meeting, from Sabbath to Sabbath, and hear many popular sermons. They approve the sentiments advanced; they admire the preacher. But there is no order, no arrangement, no clearness in their ideas of religion. The Scriptures have never been explained to them. Not a few even of the texts which they hear recited remain obscure, though the discourses were ingenious and learned. After going to church many years, they might use the confession, "I remember a mass of things, but nothing distinctively." Men need a religious education; to be taught to read and understand the Scriptures; and frequent exchanges are very apt to interfere with anything like a systematic course of religious instruction.

But you may think I am wandering from my subject. Forgive me if I often do so; since it will be done not to tire you, but to benefit some of my readers. Notwithstanding my digressions, I intend, before I close my series, to make a candid reply to the various parts of your letter. And I shall do it with the desire to promote the interests of our holy religion, and to nourish a spirit of brotherly kindness and charity. I shall studiously endeavour so to answer you, that, whatever you may think of my opinions, you may think favourably of my disposition toward you; and that others may believe that my object is to use all my power and influence in building up the pure and peaceful kingdom of the meek and lowly Jesus.

With Christian salutations, I am your friend and brother.

JONATHAN FARR.

☞ Our esteemed Correspondent in Canton will have the goodness to pardon the following errata which occurred in his article on *St. Simon*, in the last number.

Page 281,	line 10th	from the top,	for *repose*	read	*reserve.*
" 286,	" 7th		*seem*	"	*serve.*
" 289,	" 7th		*variety*	"	*unity.*

MONTHLY LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS,

JUST RECEIVED BY

JAMES MUNROE AND CO.

The Bachelor Reclaimed. Translated from the French, by Timothy Flint.
A Manual on the Christian Sabbath. By T. H. Agnew. With an Introductory Essay, by Dr. Miller of Princeton, N. J.
Manual of the Boston Academy of Music. By Lowell Mason.
Communion with God; or a Guide to the Devotional. By R. Philip.
Pious Thoughts. By a Lady of Boston.
The Parlour Letter-Writer. By R. Turner.
Life of Rev. Rowland Hill. By Rev. E. Sidney.
Peter Parley's Short Stories for Long Nights.
The Moral Testament of a Man.
A Defence of the Revolutionary History of the State of North Carolina from the Aspersions of Mr. Jefferson, by Jn. S. Jones.
Love and Pride. By the Author of Sayings and Doings.
A Letter to his Countrymen. By J. F. Cooper.
Sermons by the late Rev. E. S. Goodwin, Pastor of the First Church and Society in Sandwich, Mass. With a Memoir.

JAMES MUNROE & CO.

HAVE JUST RECEIVED FROM

THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION

THE FOLLOWING INVOICE OF

VALUABLE ENGLISH WORKS.

Unitarianism the Doctrine of the Gospel, by Lant Carpenter, 3d edition.
Farmer's Dissertation on Miracles, 3d edition.
Farmer's Essay on the Demoniacs of the N. Testament, 3d edition.
Priestley's Memoirs, with Observations on his Writings, by T. Cooper and W. Christie; and Four Posthumous Discourses, 2 vols.
Milton's Last Thoughts on the Trinity.
Bible Stories, Part 2d, containing Stories from the N. Testament, by S. Wood.
Price's Four Dissertations, 5th edition.
Belsham's Translation and Exposition of Paul's Epistles, with Notes, 4 vols.
Belsham's Memoirs of Lindsey, 2d edition.
Traité où l'on Expose ce que l'Écriture nous apprend de la Divinité de Jésus Christ, par P. F. Le Courayer.
Cellérier's Discourse on the Authenticity and Divine Origin of the Old Testament, with Notes and Illustrations; translated from the French by J. R. Wreford.
Tagart on the Claims of Unitarian Christianity to the Respectful Consideration of the Reflecting Public.
Barker's Church Establishment Anti-Christian, &c.
Harris's Harmony of Nature, Providence, and Christianity.
Review of Smith's Scripture Testimony to the Messiah.
Orthodoxy and Unbelief, by Ed. Higginson.
Joyce's Analysis of Paley's View of the Evidences of Christianity, 7th edition.
The Word made Flesh. A Sermon before the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, by W. Hincks.
Ashworth's Account of the Rise and Progress of the Unitarian Doctrine in the Societies at Rochdale, 2d edition.
Brief Dissertation on the Ministration of the Divine Word by Public Preaching, by Rob. Robinson.
Priestley's Unitarianism, Explained and Defended.
Priestley's Outline of the Evidences of Revealed Religion.
Priestley's Letter on the Logos.
Yates on the Unity of God.
Whyte's Sermons on Doctrinal and Practical Subjects, 2d edition.

JAMES MUNROE & Co. have for sale the following Theological Works: —

Jeremy Taylor's Complete Works.
Barrow's Works.
Sherlock's do.
Hall's do.
Butler's do.
Lightfoot's do.
Lardner's do.
Doddridge's do.
Paley's do.
Priestley's do.
Price's do.
Leighton's do.
Porteus's do.
Tillotson's do.

JAMES MUNROE AND CO.

HAVE JUST PUBLISHED,

Ware's Life of the Saviour, *stereotype edition.*

Lowth's Isaiah, from the tenth English edition, carefully corrected and revised.

Stewart's Philosophy of the Human Mind. 8vo. 2d ed.

Briggs's Sermon at the Installation of Rev. A. B. Muzzey.

Wisel's Discourse, on Gospel-Truths.

Two Discourses delivered before the First Parish in Cambridge; one, upon leaving the Old Meeting House, and the other, at the Dedication of the New. By William Newell, Pastor of the First Church in Cambridge.

Sunday-School and Parish Libraries will be promptly furnished, to order, on the most liberal terms.

Orders for any work published either in this country or in Europe will be attended to without delay.

The establishment of an hourly communication with the city, by coaches and baggage-wagons, enables us to assure distant customers of the execution of all orders transmitted by mail, with about the same despatch as can be had in Boston.

Liberal terms will be allowed to authors who may favour us with the publication of their works. No pains will be spared in bringing out all books in good style and with despatch, and to give them extensive circulation.

BOOKBINDING.

Henry F. McGee has the pleasure to inform his friends that he has taken Mr. Thomas Bason (from London) as partner in his business, which will be conducted in future under the firm of McGEE & BASON.

Mr. Bason is a first rate workman, and has had great experience in the finest styles of finishing in London, and has also finished, in Boston, very recently, some of the handsomest work ever offered in the city.

Rebinding, in all the various styles usually required in a gentleman's library, will be done, with attention to durability, as well as with the utmost neatness. McGEE & BASON.

H. F. McGee, grateful for the very liberal encouragement given since his commencement of business in Cambridge, assures his friends that his work will now be done in a superior manner.

Metcalf, Ewerett, and Gray, Printers, Cambridge.

David Lake

THE

Stanford Library
MAY 15 1945
B

UNITARIAN.

Vol. I. No. 8.

AUGUST, 1834.

CONDUCTED

BY BERNARD WHITMAN.

CAMBRIDGE:
JAMES MUNROE AND COMPANY.
BOSTON:
RUSSELL, ODIORNE, AND METCALF.
1834.

number contains 2 sheets — Postage, under 100 miles, 3 cents — over 100 miles, 5 cents.

CONTENTS.

PAGE.

Manufactures in their Influence upon Pauperism. No. III. *Large Manufacturing Establishments.* Continued. J. H. M. 351
The Coming of the Son of Man. H. B. GOODWIN. 356
Means of Providing the Cure and Preventing the Spread of Infidelity. C. A. BARTOL. 359
Men Accountable for their Faith. F. H. HEDGE. 370
The Unitarianism of the First Three Centuries of the Christian Era. 377
Malcolm and Witchcraft. P. SMITH, JR. 387

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Bulfinch's Holy Land and Its Inhabitants. W. N. 390
Ware's Priestley. S. W. 396
Smith on the Divine Government. J. Q. D. 399
Dr. Eaton's Sermon on the Test of Christian Character. N. 401

CORRESPONDENCE AND INTELLIGENCE.

The Prison-Discipline Society. F. W. HOLLAND. 394
Second Letter to the Rev. Adin Ballou on the Subject of Exchanges between the Restorationists and Unitarians. J. FARR. 395
A Letter on Moral Reform. H. 398

THE UNITARIAN is issued in monthly numbers, by JAMES MUNROE and Co., *Cambridge, Mass.* Each number will contain, on an average, 48 pages royal 12mo., [i. e. octavo size], and be printed on good paper and with handsome type. The price will be two dollars per annum, payable on the first of March. To those who procure and become responsible for six subscribers a seventh copy will be furnished *gratis*. The usual discount to Agents. All business letters to be addressed to the publishers.

Our Subscribers are reminded that payment became due on the receipt of the March number. Gentlemen to whom subscription-papers were sent are respectfully requested to collect and forward to the publishers, James Munroe & Co., Cambridge, Mass., the amount due from the several subscribers whose names they have sent us.

It is particularly requested of our subscribers to make their payments in Massachusetts or United States' Bank Notes; since the discount on all other bills involves a considerable loss.

It is intended to notice all the books and pamphlets which may be received, as far as they fall within the plan of this work. It is, therefore, respectfully requested of authors and publishers to forward copies of such publications.

The Editor will hold himself responsible for no articles except his own.

This Day Published,

BY

JAMES MUNROE & CO.,

Booksellers to the University.

Views of Christian Truth, Piety, and Morality, selected from the Writings of Dr. Priestley, with an Introductory Notice of his Life and Character. By Rev. Henry Ware, Jr.

Volume III. of Ware's Sunday Library, being *The Holy Land and its Inhabitants.* By Rev. S. G. Bulfinch, of Augusta, Georgia. Illustrated by a Map of Judea.

Cambridge, June 1, 1834.

THE UNITARIAN.

VOL. I. AUGUST 1, 1834. No. 8.

Manufactures in their Influence upon Pauperism.

No. III.

LARGE MANUFACTURING ESTABLISHMENTS.

[Continued from page 315.]

THE evils in large manufacturing establishments arise not from want of money, but from a want of foresight and economy. The employment requires no thought. The labourers' lives are almost inconsistent with mental action. What time have they for reflection? If they are lost in a moment's thought, their limbs may be lacerated or torn off, or their work is ruined. The husbandman may lean upon his hoe, or, when wearied, sit down beneath the shade, and give himself up to the impulse of his own soul, to thoughts called forth by the life and freshness of surrounding objects; or, if the season have changed, and the rejoicings of spring-time are over, and the sere and yellow leaf give indication of the wide-spread desolation that is at hand, his occupation leads him to reflect upon these things, and to give place to those serious thoughts and feelings which rise unbidden at such times and amid such scenes. Not so with the manufacturing labourer. "With the year, seasons return; but not to him returns the sweet approach of" spring, "or sight of vernal bloom, or summer's rose, or flocks, or herds;" months and years present one unchanging prospect. Each day is passed in waiting upon the untiring motions of matter, without a moment for anything else; and when the labours of the day are over, he returns to his crowded boarding-house,

with mind and body worn down by his stagnant activity; without heart or strength, or any of the external means and pliances for the improvement of his soul, for reflection upon the duties of life or the claims of religion. He is brought up in ignorance of the great object of his existence; he almost forgets that he has a higher duty than to wait upon machinery, or any purer pleasure than sensual indulgence. In the strong, but hardly too strong, language of a reviewer, "One might suppose that the great fabric of *national* prosperity rested upon cotton; that the two purposes for which human beings are brought into the world are to manufacture it and to wear it; that the proper definition of *Man* is a *Manufacturing Animal;* and that the use for which children are created is to feed power-looms."

Think, for a moment, upon the homes which receive these beings, when their day's work is done. The country cottage and its smiling inmates, poor, but neat and contented, which give such a charm to the simplicity of rural life, — compare this with what must be the habitations of mill-labourers in a densely-peopled manufacturing town. We would not now speak of the dens of Manchester, in which (if we can at all credit eye-witnesses) the wild beasts of the desert would scorn to dwell, — the damp cellars in which no other men or brutes than the lowest Irish labourers and their inseparable four-footed companions will consent to take up their abode, — these we would pass by. Our hearts have grown sick at the recital. They are extraordinary evils, and therefore not proper data for an argument. But put upon the matter the best possible aspect, and what sort of homes receive, and must, from the nature of the case, receive, the common operatives, when their day's work is done?

It is not, indeed, necessary nor probable that it should ever be common here, as among the lowest labourers in Manchester, for six — four children and their parents — to sleep in the same bed; or for some dozens, of different ages and sexes, to be crowded into the same room. But it is the inevitable tendency of such institutions to congregate large numbers into small places, where they can have little opportunity for mental improvement; no chance to cultivate the social affections by an unreserved and unbroken intercourse with a few friends; still less can they enjoy the luxury of solitude, and the moral and religious improvements which it affords.

"The great evil," after all, "has arisen from the separation of families, the breaking-up of households, the disruption of

all those ties which link man's heart to the better portion of his nature; namely, the instincts and social affections, and which can alone render him a respectable and praiseworthy member of society, both in his domestic relations and in his capacity of a citizen, and which have finally led him to the abandonment of the joys of home, and to seek his pleasures and excitements in pursuits fatal alike to health and to moral propriety."

Let any one of us imagine himself placed in such a situation, even with all his present tastes and habits. He might not be corrupted; but how would he contrive to improve his mind, and keep alive his religious feelings? Are we to be surprised that the uncultivated and undisciplined should fail to *make* the improvements, which we, in like circumstances, should find it impossible to *keep?* Learning flies from them in terror. "The pure and holy impulses of religion can find no home with them; but, like the dove hanging with trembling wing over the agitated waters of the deluge, seek a refuge in some more peaceful bosom, and leave them occupied solely by their own impure sensations."

The account to which the labour of children* may be turned holds out a strong inducement to parents to impose upon them the confinement of a factory life before their physical system is sufficiently developed to endure it without great and permanent injury. Thus the time and means of education also are curtailed. The consequence is, not only that children are thus brought up with minds and bodies dwarfed, but a species of hostility is cherished between them and their parents; the parents regarding them as servants, whose duty it is to labour for their support, and they considering the parents severe, interested, and unjust taskmasters.

The daughters, especially, are brought up without skill in domestic affairs, and wholly unfit to perform the important duties of wife and mother. Some idea may be formed of the maternal providence in Manchester, from the fact that more than two thirds of all the children born in the place are brought into the world by the aid of public charity. As soon as the mother is able to work she puts the child under the charge of some old person, who can do nothing else, and attends it herself only when she comes out for her meals.

* In Fall-River we understand that about one tenth of the hands are under ten years old, and in some of the factories nearly one fourth. In Lowell none are received under thirteen. In both these places parents are anxious to have their children admitted as soon as possible.

But enough and perhaps too much of these evils. The causes may be summed up in few words. Large manufacturing towns injure morals; for they destroy domestic labour; they congregate their victims into densely peopled neighbourhoods; they break up families; they lessen the demand for human strength, reducing man to a machine, or rather to the slave of a machine; they place large classes of the poor entirely under the control of the rich; they lessen individual responsibility; and diminish the facilities of moral and intellectual education.

But why dwell on these points, in a dissertation on the influence of manufactures upon pauperism? Because they are inseparably connected with it. Whatever tends to the introduction of physical, moral, or intellectual depravity, tends also to the introduction of pauperism with its most hateful attendants. Whatever tends to produce a class of men physically, mentally, and morally degraded, discourages the honourable spirit of independence, which would provide a competency for casual emergencies, and, at the same time, generates the most oppressive sufferings and evils to which poverty is exposed. What matters it to us, whether the sufferings of a brother man be occasioned by absolute starvation, or by the labour and deprivations to which he is reduced in order to drive away starvation? What matters it to us, whether his mind lose its lofty character, its provident sagacity, its towering hopes, its manly independence, in consequence of the actual pressure of cold and hunger, or in consequence of the narrow and narrowing employments, in which he is obliged to engage to prevent freezing and starving? In each alike it is poverty that acts. To the cold-blooded political economist, who regards the acquisition of wealth as the great end of human existence, these things seem otherwise. To the narrow-souled politician, who sees no higher object than to save the people's money, these things seem otherwise. So long as no contributions are levied upon him, either directly by the clamorous beggar, or indirectly by the public pauper, he is aware of no distressing cases of poverty. His neighbour and his neighbour's children may be engaged in an occupation which renders existence little better than a living death, — an occupation beneath which the flower of health is crushed, the buoyancy of youthful spirits sunk, the nice sense of moral distinctions obliterated; still they are comfortably fed and clad; and our friend sees among them no marks of suffering

poverty. Not so should we; not so will the philanthropist look upon these things. To his mind all here is the work of poverty, in its most dangerous and insinuating form. To his mind these painful and degrading employments as much claim redress and relief as absolute starvation; and that system of policy, whether public or private, which produces this state of things, is as much to be deprecated as that which brings inevitably in its train of consequences the absolute starvation of a large portion of our fellow-beings.

We do not believe that these evils to any great extent exist in this country. But let it be remembered that we have no large manufacturing towns, and of them and their influence alone have we been speaking. The evil, as it respects this country, is only prospective; Heaven grant that it may ever be so!

We know that it is customary to attribute the manufacturing grievances in England to the peculiar form of government and state of society there. With our free government and our immense room for emigration, it is said, we have nothing to fear. We cannot think this correct. How is government to suppress the grievance unless by suppressing the cause? And if the cause is vitally connected with the establishments themselves, how can government act except by discouraging such establishments? For when once they are fairly seated, when once large manufacturing towns have arisen among us, no arm of public authority will dare to raise itself against them. The rights of private property are sacred. This, like most other evils, will perpetuate itself. The population which these establishments will raise up can be supported only by them; and, in destroying them, we shall take the bread from the mouths of the very persons whom we would benefit.

We can imagine a state of things in which even large manufacturing towns will not be particularly fertile in depravity and vice. If all the proprietors were wise men and Christians, and the overseers of the same character, and, from the commencement, all buildings and laws were framed in a spirit of wisdom and benevolence, many of the evils we have noticed might be neutralized. But these are conditions which we have no right to expect. Such measures would, doubtless, in the end be most advantageous to all. But avarice is short-sighted. Selfishness is short-sighted. Love of power is short-sighted. And, unfortunately, manufacturers, like other men, are too much under the control of these short-sighted motives. Honourable exceptions there are and will

be; but until the character of the world is changed, we have no right to presume that they will be anything more than exceptions.

J. H. M.

The Coming of the Son of Man.

In a former article on this subject I explained what I suppose to have been the *primary* reference intended by our Saviour in the passage, Matthew xvi. 27, 28. This I stated to be "that establishment of his religion in the hearts of men which took place in the life-time of his apostles," and which was manifested in the rapid spread of his religion through the Roman empire, and especially in the signal overthrow of the Jewish nation, and the adoption of the Christian church, in their stead, as God's "peculiar people."

I would now add that the coming of the Son of Man, the coming to judgment, the coming in his kingdom and in the power and glory of his Father, may be regarded as having a general meaning, in which we all are interested. It is the establishment of Christianity in each individual bosom, the establishment of those principles by which alone we are to be judged, and by the influence of which upon our hearts and lives we are to become fitted for another state of existence and discipline and enjoyment. The question, whether our Saviour will appear in person as our Judge, is, to say the least, a doubtful question; one in which it becomes us not to be positive, and one in which we have but little concern. It is enough for us to know that the word which he has given us, the laws he has laid down, the same shall judge us at the last day; that if we judge ourselves, we shall not be judged. These are the truths to which we are chiefly to attend; the form and the manner of the judgment are of but little consequence. "I am come a Light into the world," was the language of Christ, "that whosoever believeth on me should not abide in darkness. And if any man hear my words and believe not, I judge him not; for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world. He that rejecteth me and receiveth not my words hath one that judgeth him; the word

that I have spoken, the same shall judge him at the last day." It need not be repeated that this judgment of the soul is an inward and a spiritual judgment. The good man needs no outward voice to tell him when to be happy, or the bad man when to be miserable. Whenever and wherever the human soul realizes the presence of the Almighty Father, and feels and thinks and acts upon that reality, whenever it comes to a full consciousness of its sins, and has an earnest and sincere longing for forgiveness and a return to holiness, whenever it sees clearly the goodness of God revealed as in the face of his son Jesus Christ, whenever and wherever it feels the great principles of piety to God and benevolence to man operating within it in the fulness of their power, then and there is a visitation of mercy like the coming of the Son of Man in the glory of his Father with his holy angels. And, on the other hand, whenever and wherever a human soul is conscious that it has exhausted all the treasures of this world in search for happiness, and in that search has exhausted its powers and lost its energy, when it feels that it is destitute of a treasure in heaven, of an interest in spiritual and heavenly things, then and there is the coming of the Son of Man to the judgment of that soul, to reward it for the deeds it has done in the body.

Now, this judgment of the soul of which I speak, this coming of the Son of Man to requite to every man according to his works, may take place in a measure in the present world. I appeal to the experience of each one of my readers, if he has not, at times, in an hour of reflection, felt that some pure and holy influence was operating within him, leading him to look inward into the recesses of his bosom, and to pass a severe and scrutinizing judgment upon his thoughts and feelings and words and actions. This judgment was of course imperfect, in the eye of Omniscience; for we cannot in this world see as we are seen and know as we are known; we are so surrounded and filled up with material things, we have so many prejudices to encounter, so much to blind the eye and to darken the mind, that it is very difficult, to say the least, to tear ourselves away, even for a season, from all material connexions; but that it can be done, and is done in some measure, no one, it seems to me, can doubt, whose mind has been enlightened and whose heart has been elevated by the principles of the gospel. It is the sentiment of a modern English writer, and one which, I believe, has much foundation in truth, "that the dread book of account which the Scriptures speak of is the mind itself of each individual, that there

is no such thing as real forgetting possible to the mind, that a thousand accidents may interpose a veil between our present consciousness and the secret inscriptions on the memory, that accidents of the same sort may rend away this veil, but alike whether veiled or unveiled the inscription remains for ever."

There is one event, however, — coming sooner or later alike to all, — one period in human existence, when this spiritual judgment takes place more effectually than at any other, when, perhaps more perfectly than he can be before, every man is rewarded according to his works. This is the event of death, the period of our separation from the present state, the dissolution of all our connexions with the material and outward world. Then it is that the human soul, disencumbered of this frail and mortal body, goes forth to stand in the presence of its Maker, naked and alone. Then the veil which so often separates the present from the past, the veil of forgetfulness, is taken away. Then must we consider ourselves as we really are. All outward distinctions, all that obscured our real characters from the world and ourselves, will then be destroyed. This, in its fullest and to us its most important sense, is the coming of the Son of Man. In this language it is frequently alluded to in the Scripture. "Watch, therefore; for ye know not in what hour your Lord may come." It is by constant watchfulness over our character and conduct, it is by that and that only, that we can be prepared for this event. The good man, the Christian, in proportion as he becomes good, in proportion as he is influenced by the spirit of his Master, has little to fear in the judgment that awaits him. For in the kingdom of heaven, which literally and properly should begin here in every man's own bosom and extend onward to eternity, in that kingdom the judgment is always going on, whether it be in the present or the future state. To him who has entered upon the work of this kingdom, with full purpose of heart to strive for greater and greater excellence, to him of whom it may be said that Jesus Christ has full possession of his soul, to him, wherever he may be, there is a voice which speaks as from the tongue of the Saviour, "Come, thou blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for thee from the foundation of the world." The good man is in heaven and the wicked man is in hell whenever conscience does its work within them, whatever be the circumstances in which they may be placed. May this truth sink deep into our hearts and inspire us all with a stronger desire for glory, honour, and immortality, that we may enter at last

upon that eternal life which is with the Father, and is given us through his Son!

H. B. Goodwin.

Means of Providing the Cure and Preventing the Spread of Infidelity.

We must begin with an observation we lament the necessity of making, that in the investigation of this subject the conviction has grown strong and serious in our minds that the spirit in which measures to these ends have often been pursued heretofore is a spirit characterized by no mark either of justice or wisdom. Infidelity has been regarded as being always *the same thing*, and as being always *an immense and horrible crime*, as an internal, concentrated purpose of evil, as a wilful and malignant vice of the soul. But so long as it is true that some speculative infidels have been, during the continuance of their intellectual unbelief, actually far superior in goodness of heart and conscientiousness of effort to some speculative Christians, so long this view must be considered unjust. If belief or unbelief is made the grand surpassing test of holiness or sin, then, surely, in all logical fairness and exactness, it must in every case prove a degree of virtue in the intellectual Christian corresponding to the degree of vice which stains the soul of the unbeliever.

But there has been not only a want of justice, but a want also of wisdom. Infidelity has been looked at in the mass, and it has been opposed in the mass. It has not been discriminated into its several parts, detected in its various and ever-varying forms, and traced to its diverse, multiplied causes. Cause, process, and effect have been blended together in one general confusion of view, or rather everything has been crowded into the *result*, which result has been thought to consist in an enormous accumulation of guilt. This mode of viewing the subject has, of course, given rise to much ill-adaptation of the *means* to the *ends* desirable to be effected, and has often caused an entire misapprehension as to the *ends* themselves.

These remarks do not, of course, apply to the manner

in which, *without exception*, infidelity has been opposed. Yet we could not refrain from commencing the subject as we have done, considering the course that has *generally* been pursued, and convinced as we are that the Christian who now presents an apology for his religion should begin with presenting an apology for himself.

We wish also to remark here that in considering the subject we shall endeavour rather to establish the *principles* according to which we should proceed in the great work than to present a catalogue of particular means. We think this course will be the more useful one, inasmuch as it is better, in the *study* of the subject, to guard ourselves against radical error than to expend all our anxiety in developing the character and tracing the results of particular modes of action. In order to justify and establish these principles, we shall be obliged to make remarks on the character of infidelity which otherwise we should, of course, omit.

In describing the means necessary to effect that in regard to infidelity which, as Christians, we should all desire and labour to have accomplished, we shall consider the subject in a three-fold division. We shall speak,

I. Of the means suggested by the character and condition, in all respects, of the infidel.

II. Of the means suggested by the character of Christianity, as it exists in the Bible and as it appears in the world.

III. Of the means suggested by the personal power of the Christian.

In presenting our conclusions on the first of these points we hope that the remarks already made in regard to the diversity of character which infidelity presents in different cases will be borne in mind. Everything we shall say of the character of infidels we by no means intend to predicate of the character of every infidel, and many things we shall have occasion to speak of will not, perhaps, apply to the majority of unbelievers. We remark this here, because, though we shall endeavour to distribute our remarks as exactly and constantly as possible to the various classes of infidels which exist, it is for many reasons obviously out of our power to do so universally.

We come now to consider the means suggested by a view of the character and condition of the infidel. And

1. By what treatment of his intellectual nature shall we act most efficiently against the power of unbelief? The

infidel prides himself upon the freedom of his mind. He is enslaved to no false principles, terrified by no unreal dangers, tormented by the cares of no imaginary world. He is a free *man* and a free thinker. Having cast off all belief in what is spiritual and future, he goes on, in the exercise of his free thought, to form his philosophy of life, to ascertain and detect the purpose of those relations in which he sees the various parts of material, organic, and animal life bound together. In his pursuit of this end, he does not proceed upon any fixed principles, he cares not what enduring realities lie *below* the passing phenomena of the world, he needs no eternal and all-comprehending truths to give strength to his system. All, to his view, is change, decay, and death. The rules of mere outward experience, developing its results to the eye of the accurate observer, these rules, brought together and compared with each other, form for him the index that points out every purpose of existence. His system of philosophy is the strangest of all sensual systems, and, in some of its parts, as incomprehensible as the blindest of all mystical ones.

We cannot and need not here describe minutely the infidel's mode of investigating truth. This can be understood thoroughly only by an examination of infidel books and infidel minds. It seems more suitable for us, at present, to make one or two general statements as to the condition into which his mind is brought by means of his principles, and as to the mode of influence by which we can reach it.

And it is important to observe that, under the influence of the system which he has adopted, the infidel perverts and distorts his intellectual faculties. His mind ceases to be a just instrument to conduct processes of right reasoning and to arrive at discoveries of truth. The intellectual balance seems lost, and the intellectual law broken. It is not so much that he reasons wrongly in a particular case, as that his mind has got to be in its very nature a wrong-reasoning mind. We are not able to see how an honest man, within the reach of any just influences, could bring himself into such a condition; but it is conceivable how a person may be initiated into such principles from his youth, and trained up to become an intellectual infidel, without serious and unusual dishonesty to his own soul. The course for us to pursue is plain. If the particular case in which we are concerned is one in which the heart remains comparatively true and unperverted, we have only to bring the understanding to obey juster laws, by presenting to it such views as shall enable it to see the narrowness of the principles to which it is

now subject. This being done, by the use of proper care on our part the recognition of those truths it most imports man to know will follow. In such a case as the present, where the intellect is unhinged from true and bound to false principles, there cannot be a more hurtful course pursued than that adopted by some, of beginning at once in a dogmatical spirit to combat *the particular errors* professed and maintained. Many seem to imagine that the only thing to be done in case of erroneous views on religious subjects, is to show themselves bold defenders of the truth and stern opposers of what is false. They therefore fall directly upon the errors and their advocates, in all the heat of warlike enterprise, with a flaming spirit of opposition, and in the proud and manifest anticipation of argumentative victory. This can hardly merit a better appellation than that of an unchristian spirit in a Christian cause. But some who are not so much inclined to dogmatism seem to think that the only way of destroying error is by its direct refutation. And as the infidel is forced by them to put himself in a posture of defence, he plants his feet the more firmly upon the ground on which he already stands. There are, doubtless, many young persons who, being brought up under the influence of infidel maxims and modes of reasoning, have become disbelievers in our holy faith through most grievous misfortune. A little care would save them. A little care in illuminating their minds with the general principles of truth would prepare them to be illuminated with the light of Christianity.

Though it is plain what object we should have in view in regard to an intellect so perverted that it beholds all things in wrong lights and judges of all things by wrong laws, it is not always so plain by what particular means this object can be effected. The influences needed will be various, often indirect and invisible. The most important principles are sometimes communicated from one mind to another by a sort of silent, insensible infusion. There is a practical skill in producing the effect we speak of, which a real anxiety for the spread of truth and a true sympathy with the minds on which we would act will do much to impart. There is a mode of gently removing erroneous notions from the mind, by gradually pouring in upon it the truth in the spirit of the truth, like the manner in which in a placid stream the preceding portions of the current are quietly moved along by those which succeed. And when we have prepared the unbeliever to be impressed by particular doctrines and truths, we must be extremely

careful to follow the same rule we have observed in recovering his intellect from its perversion to the sway of just principles, we must still continue to act harmoniously with his own mind. We are apt to be hasty and violent when we have the prospect of effecting great results, and to neglect that patient, watchful assiduity of treatment which should be practised no less by the physician of the soul, than by the physician of the body. We must not assume that summary and almost imperatorial tone which we sometimes hear expressed in phrases like the following,—"Submit to God; obey his law; receive, one and all, the doctrines of his word; give up everything of sinful objection and prejudice, and prostrate your soul before the majesty of truth."

Such language may sometimes be harmless, but, used for the purpose to which we refer, it would but chafe the intellect, violently interrupt the course of the mind, and close the heart forever against us. The mind of the infidel is, in this state, exceedingly ill-prepared to be *forced* into any conclusion; we must carry it no farther than it will voluntarily consent to go; we must excite within itself a warmth which will melt away its prejudice; we must kindle there the light before which its darkness will be scattered and the right path illuminated to its eye. We must begin with the unbeliever's own positions, with his affirmations and denials. There are no convulsions by which we can carry him in a moment through long processes of thought, and bring him to conclusions of which he has never seen the force, and to the admission of which he is exceedingly averse.—Other remarks touching the intellectual condition of the infidel will be introduced more properly under the other division of this branch of the subject, to which we now proceed.

2. We ask, What means are suggested for the prevention and cure of infidelity, by the spiritual character and condition of the infidel? Two conditions of the spiritual nature may be mentioned, in one of which, either by his misfortune or his crime, we believe every infidel is placed. The spiritual nature of the infidel is, though in very different degrees in different cases, either dormant or perverted. The power of Christianity would, in every case, rouse it to a far more intense and noble action, or recover it to a far more exact and constant rectitude.

And here we must confess our apprehension that a perverted heart and a perverted life are the just definition of much of the infidelity of the present day. We should never, it is true, so confound infidelity with irreligion as to

forget that, independent of and previous to Christianity, religion has a foundation in every human mind. There are sentiments in every man which are fitted to the spiritual world, as the wing of the bird is fitted to cleave the air, and the fin of the fish to open a path through the sea. The eye of the soul, if not kept perpetually and hermetically sealed, beholds spiritual existences and a celestial power above it; and it is as reasonable to shut the bodily eye, and then deny that the firm land extends everywhere around us and that the broad heavens stretch far away over our heads, as to close the inward vision to the perception of that uncontrollable might which sits enthroned upon the universe. But when the spiritual eye is open as it should be, when the soul has any of those spiritual aspirations which it should have, when, in a word, the heart is honest, Christianity, if it is at all understood, will be welcomed by the religious principle within, however that principle may have developed itself by its own efforts, and the more joyously as it has developed itself the more completely. This is most fully established by experience, that oracle of truth and personification of evidence to the infidel. The religious man in the soul will cry out to Christianity for support and for life.

In the light of these premises let us proceed to examine briefly the two cases just specified, that where the spiritual nature is dormant and unexcited, and that where it is perverted and debased.

It is needless to dwell upon the situation of those under the first of these cases, who have never been touched by the light of Christianity. We know that the Sun of Righteousness does not yet, like the sun in the heavens, roll its flood of light round the whole surface of the globe, but marks, as to space, comparatively but a narrow circle of brilliancy. If by an infidel be meant one who does not receive Christianity, there are hundreds of millions of infidels. Every heathen is an infidel. And surely the heathen is not a criminal for not receiving what has never been offered to his acceptance. He has an excuse that his spiritual nature is unawakened. And is the excuse of the heathen confined to heathen lands? Let us look, a moment, at the West. The West has sometimes been represented as full of positive, malignant infidelity, as ready to pour out a torrent of unbelief that should sweep away every Christian institution from the land. It is, perhaps, true that where Christianity has seldom or never been preached or heard of there are few churches and few Christians, but that

in midnight assemblies the measures are matured for the overthrow of our most holy faith we do not believe. We believe rather that men's souls are longing to welcome a pure religion to their embrace, and that in the minds of many there is a spirit which "intercedeth for them with inarticulate groans." Much of what is called decided infidelity is only a vacuum which Christianity will fill, a darkness which Christianity will disperse, a seeming deadness of the spirit which Christianity will animate with her newness of life. That there is actual infidelity in the West we do not deny. We complain only of exaggeration. Doubtless, besides the positive unbelief that exists, there is a quite extensive though easily to be explained skepticism; and, doubtless, there is the most urgent call for enlightened defenders of Christianity, who shall change a large portion of the public mind from its state of almost simple suspension between faith and unbelief to the side of truth. There is, doubtless, a crisis calling for the most serious effort. Thousands of minds may be saved from *swinging over* into the destruction of infidelity. But are there not many, in the very midst of Christian institutions, where souls have been heathenized from their very birth, who are infidels for very nearly the same reason that holds in the case just presented, because Christianity has never been applied to their minds? If there are such, and we cannot doubt it, we must treat them with a thoughtful reference to their condition. We shall no sooner convert them to Christianity by denouncing their infidelity than we should the inhabitants of Tartary. We must begin in the spirit of kindness, and with gentle yet powerful means excite the spiritual nature to a just action, and guide it in the right path with as much care as we should use towards the intellectual nature. The physician of this perishing frame must couch the bodily eye by the wisest rules and in the most cautious manner; it is only when we come to operate on the eye of the mind that we may be rude and careless and inconsiderate.

But, as we have already said, infidelity sometimes consists in a spiritual nature perverted and depraved. The infidel has sometimes made himself an infidel in the most fearful violation of his conscience and the law of God. If Christianity has been justly and luminously set forth to his intellect and moral sense, so that its nature is understood and the duty of welcoming it to his bosom is felt, and is then rejected by his affections and his will, if this rejection is persevered in and confirmed, if by his own voluntary purpose he at first darkens and at length destroys the conviction which the

providence of God and the preaching of the word had fixed in his breast, and extinguishes that sense of duty which the reflection of this belief to his heart had caused to shine there, —when all this is included in the definition of unbelief, what can be a more deadly crime! Here we find, and abundantly, all the essentials of guilt. We find a thoroughly and perseveringly dishonest will, a strong and mastering purpose against right, a determination, at all events and in spite of all beings, even the Greatest, to hold out against goodness and truth. We doubt not there are some cases in which this description is more or less realized, and wherever it is realized *infidelity* is *irreligion.* It consists in a bad heart and a bad life.

That such infidelity as this prevails in modern society to some considerable extent we fear, principally from two circumstances, among others of less importance. First, from an unusual intimacy presented in these days between infidelity and vice. The most hopeful comparison of former times with the present must, we think, convince us of this. But we wish not to dwell upon the fact. The other circumstance is the coïncidence, the almost identity, of infidelity and atheism. We must confess that in almost every infidel publication with which we have met, the veil that covers the denial of God's existence is exceedingly thin. And what is the belief of any infidels who may not deny the existence of God? How does the idea they have of God compare with that of the Christian? Is the God of an immortal being the same with the God of a mortal one? Is the God who is now seen with the eye of faith, and will hereafter be seen face to face, the same with the God whose character may be anything, whose purposes are entirely unknown, and who exists to his creatures no longer after those creatures moulder in the dust? What avails an acknowledgment of God's existence, if his existence has no concern with ours? Why should we raise our thoughts and feelings to the Spirit that inhabits eternity and presides over immensity, if that Spirit heeds not and helps not the communion we desire? If we do not admit that God *exists to us*, it is little better, as to practical religious effect, than if we deny that he exists at all.

Thorough, atheism in most cases, can be the result of nothing but a voluntary struggling against nature. Belief in God's existence is not so much a belief received by the Christian into his mind as violently shaken by the infidel from his. Disbelief requires more of positive effort than belief. We are believers in the very constitution of our souls. The voice of conscience is

the voice of God. The image of the Creator shines within us and it shines all around us. We doubt whether, even with dishonest effort, intellectual atheism can frequently exist. When it does exist it must have almost always had its first source in perverted motives and desires. Yet the ultimate effect is not brought about without an intellectual process. Let us, for a moment; examine that process. The heart has been pained and tortured by the distinct reproof of conscience against sin, and has moved to and fro in restless uneasiness under that burning eye that never slumbers. But it has seen that, for the accomplishment of its desire to be freed from all regard to God's laws by having the evidences of God's existence refuted to itself, recourse must be had to the intellect. The heart, in its better feelings, in its high aspirations, in that dissatisfaction of desires and hopes within it which still exists after the world has poured out all its enjoyments into their unfathomable capacities, in its persuasion or rather in the persuasion of these very desires and hopes that their own existence must be prolonged to the full attainment of those most clear and determinate objects for which they were made, and which it were mockery to tell them are yet answered,—yes, the heart, having such a constitution as it has, will not fulfil that desire of atheism which the anguish of its own unworthiness creates. Elsewhere it dismisses that desire for its answer. It will not suffer its own thorough perversion. It will never crucify its better self to its baser and corrupted nature. Its purer principles will never utterly give over their rights, will never submit entirely to perish. Wounded and tortured though they may be, they "cannot, but by annihilating, die." The depraved purpose must then seek other means of effecting its object. It must continue to strengthen itself till it can grow into fixed resolution, till it can gain over the will, with all its awful power for good or evil, for the exaltation or ruin of the soul. Banded together with the will, so that the desire, which before, though strong, was an uncertain and fluctuating thing, is enabled to move with a steady aim, it next makes its assault upon the intellect, and calls upon it with all power and from all its resources to confirm the horrible renunciation made of the great Creator. It is required to expend all its acuteness and power, all its knowledge and philosophy, in this work. It is made to rouse all its energies, to send forth its faculties into the worlds of matter and of mind, and collect every lurking possibility of the non-existence of Jehovah which may inhabit any nook or corner in either of these worlds. It is reminded

that the field over which it is to extend its search is so boundless that many of these possibilities may be found; and when they are all brought together and contemplated in one mass, — when they are viewed in the light of calm reason by themselves, — when every other object in the wide creation is excluded from view, not only those more important and irresistible testimonies which demonstrate an "eternal Power and Godhead," but also those millions of side-lights which glance in numberless confusion from every part of the immense structure of the universe, — when these also are shut out, lest they should trouble the eye that would gaze intently on a particular object, — when all this is done, the soul may be forced into the conclusion that there is no God. The intellect receives its errand. The strong desire outrunning from the mind marks the line of its investigation before it. Its faculties consider all things with reference to a single purpose; and thus narrowed down, so far as the *purpose* of their exercise is concerned, to a mere needle-point of action, pursue the course and effect the object of the desire. The result of the investigation is sometimes, we fear, the denial, with a bold face and a hardened heart, of His existence without whose existence no investigation of the forms of existence could be made, as indeed there would be none to investigate.

Such may have been the process, which perhaps we have described too minutely, in the minds of many of those who lead on the ranks of infidelity. Armed with the belief thus attained, they proceed to destroy the confidence of other men in their own spiritual natures, and to conduct them through the same dreadful course which they have pursued. How, then, are we to treat those whom we find in this condition?

1. We must restore to them that confidence in their own souls of which, whether willingly or unwillingly, they have been despoiled. The same caution we have already mentioned must be observed here. We are not to propose disputations on dogmatical tenets, or even arguments on general religious theses. We are not to strike violently upon the intellectual principles which the infidel maintains as correct. Least of all are we to exclaim against his inconsistency and blindness and sin, inconsistent and blind and sinful though he may be. It is not the violent passions of his mind which we wish to excite, but his moral nature; and *means* must be adapted to *ends*. We must awaken his good affections and hold out before them their noblest objects, we must call out

the principle of faith and give it its highest exercise. And, in doing this, we must use that wise variety of subordinate influences, and that self-adaptation to the changing circumstances of each different case, which a sound discretion will advise. Having thus commenced, we may proceed, with more particular purpose, to produce strong convictions and feelings in regard to great and fundamental truths which have a special connexion with the spiritual nature.

The class of persons of which we now speak are atheists. How shall we impress them with a strong faith in the existence of God? We shall make a few remarks on this point, as we are apprehensive there may be in regard to it some errors of practice. The existence of God is not only to be proved to the intellect, but to be perceived and felt by the spiritual nature. And if the *soul* can be prepared to welcome this truth, there will be no difficulty as to its intellectual belief. Let us, then, not present it as an abstract proposition external to themselves, and to be established by external arguments, but as a truth which has it foundation in their own spirits. Let us begin with their own convictions, let us fall into company with their own minds, and we may at length conduct them to a belief in God which shall be a faith both of the intellect and the heart. In calling the attention of the unbeliever to the debate of intellectual propositions, we draw him from that interior self-consciousness and self-conviction which are especially required. We take him *from* God while endeavouring to bring him *to* God. Faith in God, — what is it? A conclusion of the understanding? The last of a chain of related ideas? The result of a demonstration? We know it is something more. And how are we to prove the existence of God to a man who will not *see* him in the forms of beauty and grandeur by which he is surrounded, and in the shining frame of an immortal soul within him? *Prove* God's existence to the unbeliever! *Prove* that space is around him, the earth beneath him, and the heavens above him! *Prove* that in Him he lives and moves and has his being! Prove that he *has* life and motion and being! In respect to this eternal truth we are rather to direct the *attention* of the unbeliever, to direct the *gaze* of his mind, *affections* as well as intellect, to what he must *see*, than to show him something which has never yet been unveiled to his eye. The proposition that God exists stands above those that are to be reasoned upon and logically proved.

These remarks touch the general propriety of the case. We

do not deny that the course here opposed may in some cases be partially adopted with advantage. But we shall never be able, in giving formal demonstrations of God's existence, like demonstrations of mathematical problems, fully to convey the idea we wish to communicate. It is so all-glorious and lofty that it cannot be so expressed. Its right understanding requires the conceptions of the whole soul, — conceptions in forming which every faculty of the soul has rendered its aid.

But we can dwell no longer on this part of the subject.

C. A. Bartol.

Men Accountable for their Faith.

Among the various inquiries to which the infidelity of the times has given rise there is no one more interesting than the question, how far men are accountable for their belief or unbelief; in other words, whether faith is a proper subject of legislation. Recent occurrences have brought this question, as it respects human tribunals, before the public mind, and furnished opportunities for a full and free discussion of it. The result seems to be, that, though civil governments have a right to legislate on this subject, it is seldom expedient to exercise that right; that, on the contrary, it is better to let opinions have their free course, and trust to the good sense of the community to correct whatever is false or injurious. With regard to Divine legislation the Scriptures appear to have decided this question in the affirmative. If we may trust the natural interpretation of certain texts, or indeed the whole tenor of the New Testament, mankind are considered accountable for their belief. The justice of the law by which we are made thus accountable is not generally understood. We are so accustomed to think and speak of our religious faith as something independent of our own wills, as regulated by circumstances over which we have no control, such as the natural constitution of our minds, the force of the evidence presented to us, &c., that we do not readily understand how we can be held responsible for our belief or disbelief in any doctrine. But is this idea of faith altogether correct?

From what we know of the Deity, from the character of the religion he has given us, it certainly is not supposable that he would require of us anything inconsistent with the nature and capacities we have received from him, or that he would call us to account for that which he has not placed within our control. If, therefore, as we have supposed, the Scriptures declare us to be accountable for our faith, the fact affords a strong presumption that faith is not so wholly independent of our wills as we are apt to imagine, but, on the contrary, is a thing very much within our control. And this presumption is abundantly confirmed by a careful and candid examination of our condition in relation to the truths of religion. In the following remarks we shall enter very briefly into this examination, and endeavour to show, as concisely as possible, the justice of the law which calls us to account for our religious opinions.

It cannot be denied, in the first place, that we are possessed of faculties which fit us for the investigation of truth, that we are abundantly furnished with outward aids to inquiry, means of information, and sources of evidence. If we have these materials, we have the means of forming a correct faith. These means cannot be considered in any other light than as a part of our moral furniture, as among the appointed instruments of our moral discipline. Therefore, if we are moral beings at all, if we are justly accountable for anything, we are justly accountable for the use we make of these means, and, consequently, for the faith we form by them, or for the want of faith which may arise from the neglect of them. But moral responsibility necessarily implies a control of the will over that for which we are to answer; and this condition, it is maintained by some, is not applicable to matters of opinion. They refer us to the diversities of faith which exist among men equally zealous for the truth and equally conscientious in their pursuit of it. So great a discrepancy in the results of human investigation, it is urged, is inconsistent with the doctrine that men are responsible for their faith, for it brings us to this dilemma: either we must maintain that all who dissent from the true creed, whatever that creed may be, are morally culpable, or else we must allow that moral integrity is perfectly compatible with errors in faith. In the former case, how are we to explain the fact that men of equal excellence hold very opposite opinions? and in the latter case, what becomes of our responsibility?

It will not be difficult to reconcile this objection with our doc-

trine. A more accurate investigation will convince us that the fact on which the objection rests has been greatly overstated. It is not true that different minds, employing the same means *with equal faithfulness and equal candour*, have come to entirely opposite conclusions. This cannot be. Truth is one, and the faculties by which truth is ascertained are essentially the same — the same in kind, though not in degree — in every mind; consequently, where equal advantages have been enjoyed, and where the inquiry has been equally conscientious, the result must be the same — the same in all essential points. There may be slight differences, the same truth may be stated in diverse ways, there may even be discrepancies in unessential particulars, but there must be, under the circumstances supposed, an agreement in all that is fundamental, there must be a unanimous judgment on all the grand central truths of religion. By the eternal laws of the human mind and by the unchangeable character of God it cannot be otherwise. The truth is, differences of opinion among good and thinking men are rather nominal than real. Such men differ in form and word rather than in substance. However different the language they employ in their respective confessions of faith, a minute comparison of their real opinions as to particular points in those confessions will show, in most cases, that, while their nominal creeds disagree, their inward convictions coïncide. Thus, for example, the doctrine of original sin, as it is professed by one party, sounds absurd and shocking in the ears of the opposite party. But let two honest and intelligent inquirers from these two parties meet together and question each other on this subject, and it will be found that they do not differ essentially, it will be found that what is termed total depravity, entire alienation from God, utter corruption of the heart, signifies, in the mind of him who subscribes to such language, nothing more than indifference to religion, or a strong tendency to practices at variance with the law of God; and the existence of these evils, so strongly expressed by one party, is not denied by the other. As it is with this so it is with other disputed doctrines; though expressed in different language, they amount, in the minds of good and thinking men, to nearly if not exactly the same thing. It is a fact of frequent occurrence and well-known to everyone that individuals of different sects, who had long been accustomed to regard each other as holding the most opposite views, when an opportunity has occurred of comparing their opinions, have found to their astonishment

that there existed a very close agreement between them. So inadequate is the language of creeds to express the various shades of human opinion, so intimate is the connexion between equality of moral worth and unanimity of faith. The light of truth, like that of the sun, is one and unchangeable, it suffers no alteration or diminution from the various causes which affect our vision. But, as human observers, stationed at different points of the earth's surface and looking through a different medium, are differently affected by the same luminary, so human minds, differently educated, trained, and disciplined, have different views of the same truth. Nevertheless, in the former case it is the sun, and not a deceptive meteor, that gives its light; and even so, where the heart is pure, it is truth, and not error, that furnishes the substance of faith. Thus the objection drawn from differences of opinion is in part answered by showing that such differences, in all cases where a conscientious love of truth has accompanied the use of proper means in the investigation of truth, are nominal and not real.

But are there no real differences of opinion? Are not essentially opposite views sometimes entertained by different minds? Undoubtedly; but not under the circumstances supposed. When differences of opinion do occur where the means of investigation have been the same, they are to be ascribed to different degrees of candour and integrity in the inquirers. The error, on whichever side it lies, must be considered as wilful; the will had some influence, remote or immediate, in producing it. In some cases the influence of the will in this matter is indirect; as where a man, having been brought up with strong prejudices in favour of particular doctrines, comes to the study of religious subjects under the full influence of such prejudices, suffers them to direct his inquiries and to determine the results. Will it be said that that man is not responsible for his opinions, that he is not culpable for the errors into which he may fall, because they are the effect of education? To what purpose, then, were we endowed with a capacity for ascertaining the truth, if we are permitted to pervert it or to reject its guidance with impunity? Is not this capacity a talent given us for definite and important purposes? and will God hold him guiltless who neglects to apply it to the purposes for which it was given? Surely not. We are accountable, then, for those prejudices of which by a proper use of the powers imparted to us we might have divested ourselves. — There are other cases in which the will has a more

direct and immediate agency in determining the false views we adopt. Men are often influenced in their inquiries by motives of vanity, by intellectual ambition, by pride of opinion, or by a fear of the consequences which must follow if certain doctrines be admitted, rather than by a love of the truth. Such inquirers, foreseeing that the results to which a candid investigation would probably lead them are not such as they would wish to adopt and profess, forbear to examine, or, if they have partially examined, forbear to push their inquiries, and compel their minds to adopt other views more consonant with their feelings and with their preconceived notions. We say, compel their minds to adopt these views, that is, they voluntarily accustom themselves to contemplate them as desirable objects of faith, rack their invention for arguments to support them, until, gradually, by a natural and well-known process, they begin to believe in them, and at last are fully established in their convictions. The opinions of such persons must be ascribed to a wilful rejection of the truth. They deserve the name of falsehood rather than of error. — A third case is that in which men never think of inquiring. There are some in every community who care nothing about truth, but follow with blind indifference the guidance of those among whom their lot has been cast. Notwithstanding the pursuit of truth is going on with active zeal around them, notwithstanding the sharp contests of neighbours and fellow-citizens are constantly admonishing them to search and see on which side the truth lies, they suffer themselves to be dragged along by circumstances; and wherever, in the revolution of opinions and the division of parties, they happen to fall, there they remain, in contented ignorance. So far from examining the tenets of the party to which chance has assigned them, they do not even know what those tenets are. In this case, too, as in those above stated, it cannot be denied that the will is at fault. The obligation to inquire into the truths of religion is a solemn and it is a known obligation. No one in this age and country can neglect it through ignorance of duty. They who neglect it do so wilfully, they are culpable for their neglect and responsible for the errors which may arise from it.

These three cases comprise all the differences of opinion, consequently all the aberrations from the truth, which can occur where the requisite means of information and sufficient advantages for inquiry are enjoyed. And as in all these it appears that the aberration is wilful and might be avoided

by a proper use of the means afforded us, the objection against the doctrine of human accountability in matters of faith is fully answered.

It appears, then, that our religious opinions are not so entirely independent of our wills, are not so wholly beyond our control, as we are apt to imagine. That is not the true view of faith which represents it as a necessary result produced by the mechanical operation of certain influences on the mind. Let anyone who has arrived at fixed opinions on religious subjects examine the history of those opinions, and he will find that in the formation of them he was guided and controlled to a very great extent by the action of the will. He will find that where probabilities in favour of particular doctrines were equally balanced, it was the will which determined the preponderance and decided the election. He will find that when new light suddenly dawned upon him, it was the will which determined him to follow its guidance. But if it be true that the will has such an influence in determining our faith, there can be no doubt as to the equity of the law which makes faith an object of legislation, a ground of retribution. Our notions on the subject of faith, it is to be feared, are much too lax and altogether unworthy the age in which we live. What are the current maxims of the day in relation to this subject? "No matter what a man believes, provided he is sincere in his belief." As if it were possible to be sincere in the belief of a doctrine essentially false, at a time when the means of distinguishing falsehood from truth are in everyone's hands. Again: "It matters but little what a man's faith is, provided his actions are right." As if righteousness and truth could be separated, as if it were possible to walk according to the law of God without following the light which God has provided for our direction. It is important that men should know and feel the solemn obligation which rests upon them to think right as well as to act right. The one is as much the end and object of our being as the other. We were created to pursue and enjoy truth; and every error which is received into the mind and allowed to dwell there must have a great and pernicious influence on our destiny. It is of great consequence what we believe, and he who asserts that truth is of no importance except in the sense of sincerity knows not what truth is.

It will be readily understood that these remarks are chiefly applicable to infidels, to those who reject Christianity altogether; and it is when viewed in this bearing that the im-

portance of the subject is most apparent. The danger to be apprehended from the infidelity so prevalent at the present day consists not so much in the temptations which it presents as in the indulgence with which it is received. By what flimsy arguments do we often hear it justified! The infidel is represented as one who by the laws of his mind is compelled to believe as he does, — as one who after a candid and careful examination is forced to reject the gospel. It is difficult to say whether in such representations ignorance of human nature or indifference to truth is most predominant. But it is not difficult to perceive and to show that such representations are very false and very injurious. It is impossible for me to believe in Christianity, and at the same time to believe that anyone of sound mind, with all its evidences before him, can conscientiously reject it. It is said that the lives of these persons are a sufficient warrant for their sincerity, that it is impossible that men who are so correct in their morality should be dishonest in their professions. But is it true that the lives of infidels are generally correct? Far from it. The history of the past and the observation of the present bear witness to the contrary. For one unbeliever whose moral character is unimpeachable you shall find hundreds whose lives are bad, and not only bad but infamous. Besides, if the fact were as it is represented, the argument built upon it would have no weight. May not a man be correct in some things and faulty in others? The speculative philosopher, who spends most of his time in seclusion, has but little temptation to those sins which attract public notice. His transgressions are intellectual. In him *opposition to the truth* is the direction and form assumed by those evil propensities which in another man would have manifested themselves in sensual indulgence or in acts of fraud and violence.

But though the Scripture-doctrine of accountability in matters of faith applies principally to infidels, it applies also, in a greater or less degree, to those errors and false doctrines maintained by professed Christians. Trifling errors, such as consist rather in imperfect views of the truth than in wilful departure from the truth, and do not argue any moral obliquity on the part of those who hold them, may not essentially affect our character or happiness. It is comparatively of little consequence whether I attribute the retribution that awaits the sinner to the wrath of God or to the natural and necessary effects of sin, but it is of great consequence whether I do or do not believe in any retribution. It

is of little consequence whether in thinking of Christ I consider rather his human nature or the divine nature that was manifested in him, but it is of great moment whether I believe the man Jesus to have been identical with or inferior to the only true and living God.

Finally, in this as in all things, our responsibility is exactly proportioned to the advantages we have enjoyed and to the circumstances in which we have been placed. The pagan is not to be condemned for his unbelief in Christianity whose evidences have never been presented to him. The uneducated Christian brought up in all the ignorance of the Romish church is not responsible for the errors which he has inherited from his fathers. We are to be judged according to our means; and where the means are abundant, as they are among us at the present day, the responsibility they impose is great, and the judgment which awaits those who neglect them will be great also. Well, then, does it become us to examine our convictions and to inquire into the groundwork of our faith, that we may know whether we have conscientiously followed the light that was given us. "I believe, Lord help thou mine unbelief," was the cry of one who had caught a glimpse of the truth, and was anxiously struggling to realize its full and perfect illumination. So must we struggle and so must we pray. A distant glimmer of the truth is granted to us all; it is our business to search and study till that faint glimmer expands into a full and consistent faith.

F. H. Hedge.

[We do not remember to have anywhere met with so condensed and at the same time satisfactory a statement of the evidence for the Unitarianism of the Christian church during the first three centuries, as is presented in the essay of which the following article is a part. It was written several years ago by a gentleman of Meadville, Pennsylvania, since more generally known as the founder and principal patron of the Unitarian church in that village, and as the editor of "The Unitarian Essayist." Only a small edition of it was printed, and its circulation was almost entirely confined to the immediate vicinity of Meadville. As but few of our readers have, therefore, probably met with it, we believe we shall need no apology for reprinting it in this journal.—Ed.]

A Letter on the Unitarianism of the First Three Centuries of the Christian Era.

TO THE READER.

The following letter was originally written for "The Craw-

ford Messenger." The length to which it has been extended, and the importance which in my opinion belongs to the subject of inquiry, cause it to be now presented to the public in its present shape. Unitarianism is often represented as a new thing which has sprung up of late, and which, therefore, cannot be true. It was to remove the injurious tendency of this error that the following letter was written. As a literary man I have no pretensions. My only aim has been to state, in a plain, perspicuous manner, the evidence belonging to the subject, so as to enable everyone to judge for himself respecting an important point of ecclesiastical history, and rendered doubly interesting on account of the consequences which result from it. To the labours of Dr. Priestley I have been indebted for the extracts given from the Fathers. I have also availed myself of the historical researches of Mosheim and Gibbon; and my task has in a measure been limited to the collection of the evidence, and to embodying it in a shape which should render it perfectly accessible to all classes of readers.

I have endeavoured to conduct this inquiry with the respect due to the faith held by numbers of my fellow-Christians, but at the same time, too, with that fearless freedom of research which ought to characterize all our inquiries after truth. But we are told that the doctrine of the Trinity is a mystery, that is, something totally incomprehensible, and therefore not the subject of human reason and human inquiry. But by whom are we told this? Not by the Deity, not by Christ, or his apostles, but by men, who, feeling themselves unable to defend a favourite dogma against the objections which reason brings against it, have invented this screen to save it from investigation. And why should we not subject its truth or fallacy to this test? Surely, if there be one thing certain under the sun, it is that the doctrine of the Trinity, whether true or false, *rests entirely on human reasoning*. That this dogma is not explicitly taught in the Scriptures is admitted by all; but we are told that there are certain passages found there from which the perfect equality of the Son and the Holy Spirit with the Father may be *inferred*. The doctrine is, therefore, one of *inference*. To draw inferences is to reason; and thus we see that this dogma, concerning which we are told that we must not reason, is entirely the offspring of human reasoning. But it is evident that by drawing fair inferences from *correct* premises we can never arrive at a proposition which is a mystery, in the popular sense of that term, that is, something

incomprehensible. The result of human reasoning must always be something which the human understanding can take in and appreciate. If it be maintained that there are passages in Scripture which teach that the Son and the Holy Spirit are each of them God, equally with the Father (a thing which I totally deny), the result is not a mystery, but a very plain dogma, teaching that there are three Gods. If it be said that other passages in Scripture teach the Divine Unity, and that this constitutes the mystery, I admit the fact, but deny the inference. We have then not a mystery, but a plain, palpable contradiction, which would shake the very foundation of revelation. And such, too, has been but too often the effect of this dogma. I have met with several men in life, who, though educated as Christians, had ceased to believe in revealed religion, and everyone of these had been driven into infidelity by the impossibility of believing the doctrine of the Trinity and the dark dogmas of Calvinism. I am the friend of Christianity, because I believe it to be the cause of human happiness; and if this letter should save anyone from rejecting Christianity, or should serve to remove even only some one troublesome or perplexing doubt, my labour will not have been fruitless.

Meadville, November 17, 1830.

A writer in "The Crawford Messenger" of the 11th November, under the signature of "A Presbyterian," has deemed proper to make the assertion that the Christian church, during the first three centuries, was Trinitarian. Of this I shall certainly not complain. Perhaps I ought to thank him for furnishing me with the opportunity of entering somewhat more fully than I have formerly done into the inquiry as to the opinions held on this subject during the first three centuries, as that is a subject well deserving of a careful examination. I could have wished that this investigation had devolved on some one more capable of doing justice to it than I am, or that, when it fell to my share, I might have had more leisure to bestow on it than my avocations will allow of; but I flatter myself, that, with the proofs which I can at any moment command, I shall be able to satisfy the reader that "A Presbyterian" is mistaken in every one of the positions he has taken. The only thing in that gentleman's essay which I have seen with regret is the strong personal feeling which

pervades every part of it. Surely, men such as "A Presbyterian" and myself ought to be able to discuss a historical fact, or even a religious opinion, and arrive at different results, without our suffering such difference of sentiments to degenerate into any feeling other than that of personal friendship and good will.

Before I enter into the main subject of our inquiry, I wish to make a few prefatory remarks which have a strong bearing on it, and which I request the reader to keep constantly in mind in the perusal of the following letter.

1. By the term *God*, we, in this age and in this country, constantly understand the Supreme Being. But during the first three centuries, in heathen countries, where gods were numerous, and where almost every emperor on his death became a god, the term *God* must have had a much more loose and indefinite meaning; and hence, when we find the title *God* very freely applied to Christ by the Christian writers of that era, it does not follow that they believed him to be the Supreme God. This use of the term *God* in a qualified or subordinate acceptation prevailed also among the Jews, in proof of which I beg leave to refer the reader to Exod. xxii. 28, where we read, "Thou shalt not revile the gods (meaning the judges) nor curse the ruler of thy people"; also to Exod. vii. 1; Ps. xlv. 6, 7; Ps. lxxxii. 1; John x. 35.

2. The same remark applies to the term *worshipping*. That term among us Protestants is almost exclusively used to designate that religious homage and adoration which man pays to his Maker; but the word in the original Greek, which has been thus translated, has a much less definite meaning; it generally expresses the reverence or salutation paid by any inferior to a superior, leaving the degree of the homage in each case to be determined by the known relation between the parties; and if our translators, in all cases where Christ is concerned, have deemed it proper to render the original Greek by the term *worshipping*, that only proves the bias on the minds of the translators, and nothing further. On this subject I beg leave to refer the reader to 1 Chron. xxix. 20, where it is said, "And all the congregation . . . *worshipped* the LORD, and the king; and to Matt. xviii. 26, where the servant is said to have *worshipped* the king.

3. We must not consider any proof which we may find of the preëxistence of Christ evidence of his proper Deity. A large portion of the Unitarians believe in the preëxistence,

as firmly as the Trinitarians do; but surely, to have existed before the creation of the material universe, and to be the self-existent Jehovah, are different things. Most, if not all, of the Fathers, after Justin Martyr, believed that God, previously to the creation of this world, created an intelligent, superangelic being, called the Logos (Word), Son, or Christ, *by whose instrumentality* he afterwards created the world, and who, at a subsequent period, became the medium of God's intercourse with man during the Old Testament dispensation.

4. When in the writings of the third century we meet with the term *Trinity*, as we occasionally do, we must not give to that term the meaning which it now has. The *Trinity* of that age was composed of the Supreme God, and of two other beings *perfectly distinct from and subordinate to him*, called the Son and the Holy Spirit, who acted as ministers of the Supreme God. For proof of this I beg leave to refer the reader to Jortin's *Remarks on Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. II. pp. 253 – 255.*

With these obvious and necessary remarks, the propriety of which will become more apparent hereafter, I pass to the consideration of the points made by "A Presbyterian."

The first point made by "A Presbyterian" is, that "The early Fathers are direct in their testimony that the divinity of Christ and the Holy Trinity was their own faith, and that no writer of those centuries, prior to the council of Nice, intimates that such was not the faith of the church." Such is the *assertion*, now let us see the *fact*.

In the first century we find the apostle Peter, in his discourse to the Jews recorded Acts ii. 22 – 24, telling them, "Ye men of Israel, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, *a man* approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs *which God did by him* in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know, him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain, *whom God hath raised up;*" and, verses 32, 33, he adds, "This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses; therefore, being *by the*

* The passage in Jortin to which reference is here made we presume to be the following: Speaking of the religious sentiments of Manichæus, who lived in the third century, Jortin remarks, "He held a Trinity, and the consubstantiality of the Persons, but he thought them as really distinct as three men. We must not hence charge him with Tritheism, unless we would involve in the same charge *many of the most illustrious Fathers*, who were *in the same sentiment*." — Ed.

right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear;" and, verse 36, we read, "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath *made* that same Jesus whom ye have crucified both Lord and Christ." St. Paul writes, 1 Cor. viii. 6, "But to us there is but *one* God, *the Father*, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord, Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him." 1 Tim. ii. 5, he says, "For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." And, Eph. iv. 5, 6, we read, "One Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, *who is above all*, and through all, and in you all." Surely, the men who speak and write thus must be Unitarians. No Trinitarian would have expressed himself in this manner.

The *genuine* works of those called Apostolical Fathers belonging to the first century I believe to be in perfect unison with this. In them the term *God* is never applied to Christ, that I know of. If it is, I will thank my antagonist to point out the place.

In the second century we have, first, Justin Martyr, A. D. 140, who says, speaking of Christ, "Than whom we know no prince more kingly and more righteous, after the God who generated him;" * and again, speaking of the God in heaven, and the God upon earth (Christ) who conversed with Abraham, he says, "The former is the Lord of that Lord who was upon earth, as *his* Father and *God, the cause of his existence, and of his being powerful and Lord and God.*" †

We next have Athenagoras, A. D. 178, who does not consider Christ as *the one God*, but as one employed by the one God. He says, "Our doctrine teaches us that there is one God, the Maker of all things, who made all things by his own Logos."‡

Clemens Alexandrinus, who lived A. D. 194, says, "The Mediator performs the will of the Father. The Logos is the Mediator, being common to both, the Seal of God, and the Saviour of men. Of the one he is the *servant*, but our instructer." § And again, "There is one unbegotten, almighty Father; and one first-begotten, by whom all things were, and without whom nothing was made. For one is truly God, who made the Origin of all things, meaning his first-begotten Son." ‖

* Apol. I. p. 17. † Dial. p. 413. ‡ Apol. p. 40.
§ Pædag. Lib. III. Cap. I. p. 215. ‖ Strom. Lib. VI. p. 644.

In the third century we meet with Origen, perhaps the most learned of all the Fathers, who flourished about the year 225. He says, "The Father only is the Good; and the Saviour, as he is the image of the invisible God, so he is the image of his goodness." * "The Logos did whatever the Father ordered." † Again he says, "The Saviour and the Holy Spirit *are more excelled by the Father* than he and the Holy Spirit excel other things, &c.; and he (the Saviour), though excelling such and such great things (namely, thrones, principalities, and powers) in essence and office and power and Godhead, *is by no means to be compared with the Father.*" ‡ Speaking of the difference between the Greek prepositions διὰ and ὑπό [*dia* and *hupo*], the former denoting *instrumentality*, and the latter proper *causality*, he says, "If all things were made (διὰ) [*dia*] by the Logos (that is, as the Instrument), they were not made (ὑπό) [hupo] by the Logos (that is, as the cause), but by one *who is better and greater than the Logos;* and who can that be but the Father?" §

The next Father I shall produce is Novatian, who flourished about the year 240. He says, "The Father only is the only good God." ‖ "The rule of truth teaches us to believe, after the Father, in the Son of God, Christ Jesus, our Lord God, but the Son of God, of that God who is one, and alone the Maker of all things." ¶ "Though he was in the form of God, *he did not attempt the robbery of being equal with God.* For though he knew that he was God, of God the Father, *he never compared himself with God the Father;* remembering that he was of the Father, and that he had what the Father gave him." ** "The Son is less than the Father, because he is sanctified by him." †† "God the Father is the Maker and Creator of all, who alone has no origin, invisible, immense, immortal, eternal, the one God, to whose greatness, majesty, and power nothing can be preferred or compared." ‡‡ "If Christ had been uncreated, and likewise unbegotten, there would have been two unbegotten, and therefore two Gods." §§ "The Son does nothing of his own pleasure, nor does he come of himself; but in all things obeys his Father's commands." ‖‖

---

* Com. Vol. I. p. 377.
† Ad. Celsum, Lib. II. p. 63.
‡ Com. Vol. II. p. 218.
§ Com. Vol. II. p. 56.
‖ Ch. IV. p. 11.
¶ Ch. IX p. 26.
** Ch. XXII. p. 84.
†† Ch. XXVII. p. 102.
‡‡ Ch. XXXI. p. 119.
‖‖ Ch. XXXI. p. 123.
§§ Ch. XXXI. p. 122.

The last of the writers of the third century whom I shall cite is Arnobius, who flourished about the year 290. He says, "The omnipotent and *only* God sent Christ"; * and again, "Christ, a God, spake by the order of the principal God." †

In the beginning of the fourth century we meet with Lactantius and Eusebius, who flourished, the first about the year 310, and the latter about the year 320. Lactantius says, "The Son patiently obeys the will of the Father, and does nothing but what the Father wills or orders." ‡ "He approved his fidelity to God; for he taught that there is one God, and that *he only* ought to be worshipped; *nor did he ever say that he was God.* For he would not have preserved his allegiance, if, being sent to take away a multiplicity of Gods and to preach *one God*, he had brought in another, besides that one. This would not have been to be the herald of one God, or of him who sent him, but have been doing his own business, and separating himself from him whom he came to honour. Wherefore, because he was so faithful, because he assumed nothing to himself, that he might fulfil the commands of him who sent him, he received the dignity of perpetual Priest, the honour of supreme King, the power of a Judge, and the title of God." § Eusebius says, "There is one God, and the only-begotten comes out of him." ‖ "Christ *being neither the Supreme God, nor an angel, is of a middle nature between them;* and being neither the Supreme God, nor a man, but the Mediator, is in the middle between them, the only-begotten Son of God." ¶

I have thus carried the examination from the first days of Christianity down to the Council of Nice, in the year 325. The witnesses I have produced are not obscure heretics, but men of high standing in the church, and emphatically denominated its *Fathers*, many of them the very men cited by my antagonist. And now it appears to me that, if human language has any meaning, I have shown that none of these men were Trinitarians according to the present meaning of that term, but that they all believed our Saviour to be a Being *perfectly distinct from and subordinate to the Father*, which is exactly the faith held by Unitarians. What establishes this fact still further is, that in the next age, when the church really became

---

* Lib. II. p. 57.
† Lib. II. p. 50.
‡ Lib. IV. Sect. 29, p. 447.
§ Lib. IV. Sect. 14, p. 395.
‖ De Laudibus Const. p. 752.
¶ Contra Marcellum, Lib. I. p. 8.

Trinitarian, we meet no more with language such as that which I have quoted; a sure sign that a change of sentiments took place about this time.

The second *assertion* of "A Presbyterian" is, that all who, during the first three centuries, denied the Divinity of Jesus Christ and of the Holy Ghost were constantly considered heretics, and as such expelled from the church. Now this assertion is, if possible, still more unlucky than the first. In addition to the mass of evidence already produced, I shall give only that of Mosheim, a Trinitarian, and the best of our ecclesiastical historians. Speaking of the famous Arian controversy, he says (*Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. I. p. 411), "Soon after its commencement, even in the year 317, a new contention arose in *Egypt*, upon a subject of much higher importance, and with consequences of a yet more pernicious nature. The subject of this fatal controversy, which kindled such deplorable division throughout the Christian world, was the doctrine of *three Persons in the Godhead;* a doctrine which in the three preceding centuries had happily escaped the vain curiosity of human researches, and been left undefined and undetermined by any particular set of ideas. The church, indeed, had frequently decided against the Sabellians and others, that there was a real difference between the *Father* and the *Son*, and that the *Holy Ghost* was distinct from them both, or, as we commonly speak, that three distinct Persons exist in the Deity; but the mutual relation of these Persons to each other, and the nature of that distinction that subsists between them, are matters that hitherto were neither disputed nor explained, and with respect to which the church had, consequently, observed a profound silence. Nothing was dictated to the faith of Christians in this matter; nor were there any modes of expression prescribed as requisite to be used in speaking of this mystery. Hence it happened that the Christian doctors entertained different sentiments upon this subject without giving the least offence, and discoursed variously concerning the distinctions between *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost;* each one following his respective opinion with the utmost liberty." Mosheim also tells us, Vol. I. p. 213, that the Nazarenes were Unitarians, and that they were never reckoned among the heretics by the early Christians. He says that Epiphanius, a writer of the fourth century, is the first who places them among the heretics. On these admissions of Mosheim I would remark, that they are

utterly irreconcilable with the Trinitarianism of the first three centuries. That while all believed Christ to be a subordinate being, all should live in harmony, though some believed somewhat differently as to the mode of his existence from what others did, — this is perfectly natural, and what we see in our own days; but that some should have deemed him to be the Supreme, Self-existing Jehovah, the true object of religious worship, and that others should have believed him to be a subordinate, dependent being, and yet that this difference of sentiment should never have produced dispute or gainsaying between the parties, this is utterly impossible. The history of our own time shows that it is so.

The third and fourth points made by "A Presbyterian" assert that Christ was, during the first ages, the object of prayer among Christians. On this head, in addition to what Lactantius says on this subject, as already noted, I wish to produce Origen, who says, "If we know what prayer is, we must not pray to any created being, not to Christ himself, but only to God, the Father of all, to whom our Saviour himself prayed." * "We are not to pray to a brother, who has the same common Father with ourselves; Jesus himself saying that we must pray to the Father through him. In this we are all agreed, and are not divided about the method of prayer; but should we not be divided, if some prayed to the Father, and some to the Son?" † And Eusebius says, "Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, and the first-born of every creature, teaches us to call his Father *the only true God*, and commands us *to worship him only*." ‡

I flatter myself I have now proved that "A Presbyterian" was totally in error in the first four points made by him. Before I have done, I hope also to establish that he has equally mistaken the decrees of the Council of Nice. But it is time that I should pass to a higher species of evidence to establish the Unitarianism of the first three centuries.

[The remainder in the next Number.]

---

* De Oratione, p. 48.
† De Orat. p. 51.
‡ Præpar. Lib. VII. Cap. 15, p. 327.

Malcolm and Witchcraft.

In Malcolm's "Dictionary of the Bible", under the article *Witch*, there is the following sentence:—"That such persons," that is, witches, "have been found among men is abundantly plain from Scripture"; and in proof of this assertion he points to several passages, which it is the object of this article to notice. We did not suppose, however, that any person of any literary eminence would, at the present day, defend the doctrine of witchcraft, though the expression occurs several times in the common version of the Bible. A witch, in the common acceptation of the term, we suppose to mean one who has connexion with some evil, invisible power. This superstition was popular at the time our present version of the Bible was made; it is not, therefore, surprising that phraseology favouring this notion should have been used by the translators, in rendering certain words rather of a vague meaning, especially when it is borne in mind that king James, their patron, was a firm believer in the doctrine of witchcraft. It has been a great misfortune both to religion and humanity, that this word ever found a place in our English Bible. As it is stated in Exodus, chap. xxii. 18, according to the common version, "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live," ignorant and bigoted men have claimed a warrant to execute capital punishment on those who were deemed guilty of this supposed crime; and the result has been that many innocent persons both in this country and Europe have lost their lives. But we venture to affirm that there is no passage in the Bible that can be said to give the least support to this superstitious notion.

The Greek version of the Old Testament, which was made by learned Jews about 200 years before the Christian era, and which was used by Christ and the apostles, as their quotations from it evidently show, may be considered a valuable commentary on those ancient Scriptures, and enable us to arrive at the correct meaning of those passages in which the words *Witch* and *Witchcraft* are found. The word translated *Witch* is in Greek * a medical term, from which our English word, *Pharmacy*, is derived. It literally means *A mixer of drugs*. Hence this term is applied to that class of impostors called necromancers, sorcerers, and jugglers, who practised in-

* Φαρμακὸς.

cantations by the use of drugs and other deceptive arts, to impose on the credulous multitude. Thus the passage in Exodus already noticed means nothing more than this: "Thou shalt not protect sorcerers." This word occurs again in Deuteronomy, xviii. 10, in connexion with another, which is usually translated "having a familiar spirit", but which in the Greek means one that has the wonderful faculty of speaking from the chest, literally, *A belly-speaker*, or, in the language of the present day, *A ventriloquist*. Such was the woman of Endor whom Saul consulted. She is said to have had a familiar spirit, which led the translators to pronounce her a witch, as appears from the caption of the chapter. Hence we hear so much of the witch of Endor. The passage noticed in Deuteronomy is in the Greek version as follows: "Let there not be found among you anyone.... who practiseth divinations, or consulteth omens or augury, or maketh use of drugs to practise incantation, or a belly-speaker, or an astrologer, or a necromancer; for everyone who practiseth such things is an abomination to the Lord thy God." This we believe to be the true meaning of the passage, and it will be readily perceived how little support it gives to the doctrine of witchcraft.

The word *Witchcraft* occurs several times, and in Galatians v. 20, it is reckoned among "the works of the flesh." The word* rendered *Witchcraft* is a derivative from the one which is in the English version rendered *Witch*, and means the art of practising incantations, or sleight of hand, an art which the Jews were taught to regard as odious and immoral; hence the Jewish lawgiver and succeeding prophets spoke against those who practised it with unmeasured severity. It was an art derived from the heathen, which was another circumstance why the Jews were to regard it with so great aversion. There is no evidence that those who were instructed in this art were supernaturally gifted, or that they knew or practised anything which is any-wise akin to what in later times has been ignorantly and superstitiously called *Witchcraft*.

P. Smith, Jr.

---

* Φαρμακία.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

The Holy Land and Its Inhabitants. By S. G. Bulfinch. Cambridge. James Munroe & Co. 24mo. pp. 298.

We have long felt the want of a little work, like this, containing a condensed account of the Holy Land and its inhabitants, adapted to popular use. In order to understand the Scriptures it is necessary to have a general acquaintance, at least, with the character and condition, with the manners, customs, and opinions, with the domestic, political, and religious institutions of the people among whom the events recorded took place. But, independently of this consideration, we all feel a peculiar interest in everything that relates to a land and a nation in which our Saviour began and fulfilled his great mission, and to which our religious associations are so strongly bound.

"The traveller," says Mr. Bulfinch, "may pause and meditate on the plains of Greece, and feel that her departed wise and great have left a portion of their spirit in the air they once breathed, the footsteps of their power on the soil they once trod; but is there not a holier feeling, the consciousness of a loftier presence, to the pilgrim standing on the hill of Zion, within the scenes of David's power? What classic recollections can equal those which to the Christian render Palestine another home, and Jerusalem a city of the soul? In those streets his Saviour taught; among the olives on that hill he withdrew to meditate with his disciples; in yonder village he wept over his buried friend, then spoke the word of power, and the grave gave up its dead; in that garden he poured forth the prayer of agony; on that hill he died. Let the Christian often wander through scenes like these, that his interest in the word of God, his knowledge, his piety may be increased." — p. 2, 3.

The object of Mr. Bulfinch's work is to present a condensed account of the history, the laws, the religious rites, and domestic customs of the Jews. The first chapter contains a description of the geography, climate, scenery, &c. of the Holy Land. In the six following chapters we have a judicious abridgement of the history of the Jewish people, from the call of Abraham to the present time. The five following chapters are occupied with an account of the religious institutions, festivals, and ceremonies of the Jews; of their civil and judicial polity; of war, commerce, agriculture, and the arts and sciences among them; and, finally, of their domestic customs and usages.

The whole book is calculated to be very useful to the young student of the Scriptures, as well as to the Sunday teacher, and all who are interested in obtaining and diffusing a correct knowledge of Jewish history and antiquities. The larger works of Jahn, Calmet, and others are not accessible to the greater portion of the religious community, and are not adapted to general use. We are greatly indebted to Mr. Bulfinch for bringing the information which they contain into a briefer and more attractive form in the volume we are noticing.

We observe a few typographical errors; but, in general, the work is well executed, in the style of the two preceding volumes of the Sunday Library for Young Persons, edited by Rev. H. Ware, Jr.

W. N.

Views of Christian Truth, Piety, and Morality. Selected from the Writings of Dr. Priestley. With an Introductory Notice of his Life and Character. By Henry Ware, Jr. Cambridge. James Munroe & Co. 1834. 12mo. pp. 287.

Many flippant writers of ephemeral discourses and essays have denounced Priestley as a profane critic in theology and a shallow philosopher. Some have even had the rashness to class him, with respect to religion, among infidels. Admitting that he spread himself over too wide a surface of physical and intellectual science, and even of theological inquiry, to be always exact and thorough; yet, upon the various subjects which he handled, it would be difficult, if possible, to single out an individual, in modern times, who has given such an impetus to important philosophical discussions, or who has thrown out so many hints which have been taken up and carried forward, and have ended in great results. But our business with him at this time is as a theologian and Christian. And here we think it must be admitted that he was either remarkable for the firmness and constancy of his faith in the divine origin of Christianity, and for his uniform piety and devotion, — or that he was an arrant hypocrite and deceiver. This seems to be the only alternative.

Amidst all the harsh language of his revilers, we do not remember that he has ever been charged with hypocrisy or deception; the charge would be too obviously absurd. But how does it appear that he was remarkable for his faith and piety? We refer to the extracts from his writings, on various occasions, which are collected by Professor Ware; to which, if it were ne-

cessary, might be added similar extracts to a great extent. With such evidence, though we have charity enough to ascribe the asperity with which Priestley's Christian character has been impugned by his enemies to ignorance, yet we have not charity enough to regard their ignorance as wholly excusable. Let them account for his strenuous defence of the divine origin of Christianity, in which he has not been surpassed; for his delight in reading and studying the Scriptures, especially when he "read them with a practical view," of which he speaks most feelingly; for his strict requirements concerning Christian duties, in all the relations of this life, and in the prospect of a future life; for his earnest endeavours to produce reverence for the Lord's day, and for Christian worship and ordinances; for his cheerful and assiduous labours in imparting religious instruction to the young, and in promoting in all persons that elevation of character rising above sin and sensuality and bondage to the world, and fear of reproach, of suffering, and of persecution for conscience's sake, inspired by Christian truth and Christian hopes; in fine, for his habitual devotion, his firm trust in Providence, and consequently heartfelt submission, — his unwavering faith in a future righteous retribution, sustaining him triumphantly through the trials of life. Let all those who profess and call themselves Christians weigh these things, and place in the opposite scale, if they please, his materialism, which appears, in him, never to have stood in the way of the most elevated and spiritual views of Deity, or of thorough faith in a resurrection to a future life, a life of perfect intellectual bliss to the faithful Christian. Let them place in the same scale all his supposed errors concerning the person of the Saviour, the depravity of human nature, the manner in which man's salvation was secured by Jesus Christ, and the whole tissue of metaphysical theology. Of how little importance, after all, do such subtilties and metaphysical niceties appear, compared with those sublime and affecting truths which reach the heart and make the life better, giving us the only true foretaste of heaven!

The closing remarks of Priestley upon "The Duty of Christians respecting the Present Prevalence of Infidelity" show how a righteous man should feel when assaulted either by narrow Christians or by open infidels.

"Let the rational Christian, who justly disclaims such doctrines as those of original sin, arbitrary predestination, the Trinity, and vicarious satisfaction, as the grossest corruptions of his religion, and the principal cause of its present rejection (and which, on this account, his regard for Christianity requires that he should take every opportunity of exposing), be equally prepared to meet the too vehement zeal of the defenders of these doctrines (who are at present the great majority of the nominally Christian world), persons who will not scruple to treat him as a deist or atheist, and also the hatred of the real deists and

atheists of the age. For if he be zealous and active in promoting what he deems to be pure Christianity, their sentiments concerning him will not deserve a softer name. However, the malignity of both are alike insignificant, considering the great object we have in view; and they are infinitely overbalanced by the solid satisfaction which arises from the cordial esteem of a small number of judicious Christian friends, who will approve of our conduct, and join us in it; to say nothing of the exquisite delight which arises from the consciousness of a steady and undaunted pursuit of what is true and right, the hope we entertain of the approbation of our Maker, and the glorious reward of immortality."—pp. 146, 147.

Professor Ware's selections from the religious and moral writings of Priestley appear to us well fitted to fulfil the double purpose he had in view, namely, "to instruct and animate religious readers, and do something [everything necessary] towards vindicating the character of an injured man." They furnish all the testimony requisite for this purpose from the mouth of the author. The "Memoir of Dr. Priestley" (prefixed to the Selections), which, we think, is very judiciously composed, contains all the additional evidence needed to insure the high respect of all candid men for the subject of it, no less as a Christian than a very estimable man and distinguished philosopher.

S. W.

Illustrations of the Divine Government. By T. Southwood Smith, M. D. Second American from the Fourth London Edition. Boston. B. B. Mussey. 12mo. pp. 288. 1834.

We are glad to see a second American edition of this work, in so elegant a form. Whatever may be thought of the opinions on those great and difficult subjects,—the purposes of the Divine government, the origin and uses of sin, and the final condition of man, which the author has undertaken to discuss, his book will be read with delight, we believe, by every candid person. It breathes throughout the spirit of a beautiful, thoughtful, discriminating and devout mind. The author has seen fit to call it "Illustrations of the Divine Government." And this expresses the character of the work. But its ultimate object, on which everything is made to bear, is to prove the doctrine of the final restoration of all mankind to virtue and happiness. We are inclined to believe that the premises on which he has constructed his most important argument are unsound, nor are we satisfied with the proofs he brings from Scripture. We do not assent to his conclusion. But we have read his work more than once

with delight. It is a truly Christian discussion. We do not know a book, which touches on controverted topics of theology, more deeply imbued with the spirit of unobtrusive candour. Nothing of harshness, much less of bigotry, has been suffered to breathe over its pages. We cannot resist the conviction that we have been communing with a truly benevolent and truth-loving mind. To read a book so written is as delightful as it is difficult to find one. The work is characterized by force and fulness of argument, and, at the same time, by great simplicity, and richness of illustration. We might make some beautiful extracts, especially from the chapters on the goodness of God; but as our limits do not permit us to make long quotations, and we cannot otherwise do justice to the author, we forbear.

J. Q. D.

Test of Christian Character. A Sermon by PETER EATON, D. D. 8vo. pp. 16.

JESUS CHRIST would not have men to be even *Christians*, in any sectarian sense. By whatever name one might be called, whether Jew or Gentile, that man was acknowledged to be of his fold, if he was only a *good* man. The whole aim of his life, and the one sole purpose of his mission, were to make men *good*, — lovers of God, lovers of one another, pure. As to matters of doctrine, they were insisted upon solely as being subsidiary to this end, — helps, through the influence of which upon the mind a man might be made a good man.

We do feel glad when, once in a while, above the perpetual din about doctrines, our ears are permitted to hear, as in the Sermon before us, this, the main truth of our religion, earnestly set forth.

"*It is the life*," says Dr. Eaton, "*that stamps the character*. . . . . When I see an individual uniformly manifesting love and veneration for the Supreme Being, benevolence and charity to his neighbour, and all the moral virtues in his life, I ask not, What is his faith, or, What his experience."

No, nor does anybody who, from his reading of Christ's words, and the observation of his life, has been able to gather a glimpse of the errand on which he came. That such a man is a *Christian*, in the only proper sense of that term, is what Jesus laboured and died to make men, everyone, whose mind is not the utter slave of party, must and will at once admit. To set this truth clearly forth, and endeavour to make sectarians believe it, is the object of this Sermon. The reasoning is plain

and forcible, — we think no one can go through with it without pronouncing it satisfactory. We conclude with the expression of our thanks to Dr. Eaton for the strong common-sense view in which he has presented this all-important subject.

N.

CORRESPONDENCE AND INTELLIGENCE.

THE PRISON-DISCIPLINE SOCIETY.

This society has for its object the improvement of prisons and of all public criminal institutions throughout the country. Its intention is to introduce Christian principles into the articles of our criminal code, and provide for those convicted of their violation all the means of moral reformation.

This society has two modes of operation. One is, the collection of facts respecting the whole business of criminal imprisonment throughout the world. The other is, spreading those facts before magistrates, judges, philanthropists, and patriots, and inducing them to improve upon the experience and the invention of others.

According to the first mode of operation, it labours to obtain a general expression of opinion and a general communication of information, from benevolent men in England, Europe, and America, respecting the extent to which abuses now prevail, the remedies proposed, and as to what systems of prison-regulation have been found beneficial and availing. It was familiarly known that no two countries or states have the same systems. It was believed that every part of Christendom had something peculiar to itself, of good or of evil, in its police and its prisons. It was confidently expected that a general consideration of a scheme of prison-discipline successfully carried through in one place might bring about the second operation of the society and lead to its adoption elsewhere, and, ultimately, to benefits almost incalculable to humanity and the world. The collection of information of every kind about the whole subject, the preparation of plans of prison-discipline, the invention of new systems, the examination of criminal codes, the enlisting of public attention in the work, were considered matters of the first importance to the present time and to posterity.

The second mode of operation was of not less consequence. From the increase of population and of crime, institutions of this description are constantly in the process of erection all over the land, and are generally (and were uniformly, before this society began its operations) based on principles acknowledged to be false, injurious, and unchristian. This society aims, as far as possible, to reform the old establishments; but, at least, not to allow the erection of any new ones, in the face of facts which prove conclusively that, if erected as they used to be, they must become pests to society, and the instruments of utter degradation to those shut up in them.

This society desires to step in, wherever a jail or prison is about to be erected, and inform magistrates and men of authority what plans are successful, and what are not, neither can be. And they are disposed to think that, when it is demonstrated (to men who sit in high places, and are the servants of the people to say how the people's moneys shall be used) how, by a plan as old as Howard, much yearly expense may be saved, and governments spared the reproach of corrupting the imprisoned, and thereby injuring society and degrading human nature, such plan will be instantly adopted in preference to one expensive, corrupting, and cruel.

It is but a few years ago, a few years before the origin of the Prison-Discipline Society, that Leverett-Street jail was erected in Boston. And how did that enlightened city proceed in providing for the punishment of breaches of the law and the reformation of the criminal? Why, the first step was to put up such a building as should, by a little labour of its inhabitants, secure entire liberty of oral communication from room to room and story to story; that was attended to first. And second, that the apartments should be so large that many persons of different characters should be confined together, for purposes, no doubt, of mutual improvement. The number so united is sometimes six. The third thing was to preclude all possibility, at least all probability, of the industrious employment of time. And fourthly, by way of climax, to provide that the imparting of moral instruction should be impracticable, unavailing, and hopeless.

Thus solitary confinement, hard labour, and religious counsel, the three unfailing panaceas, are shut out from men and women who more than anybody in the community need these medicines for the soul! and, in spite of all that has been said on the subject, time and again, one fortieth part of the population of the place — including the emigrant just landed, the suspected boy, the persecuted debtor, the white-headed villain, and murderer awaiting trial — all are mixed together, in a common sentence of misery and degradation.

The Prison-Discipline Society, therefore, demands the support of every philanthropist, every patriot, and every Christian; because it has in view the entire eradication of such abuses of the purposes of justice, and the substitution, universally, of institutions which shall benefit the community, by taking from the vicious their proneness to vice, and erecting in its place an unchangeable purpose of purity, and an invincible steadfastness of obedience to duty and to God.

F. W. Holland.

SECOND LETTER TO THE REV. ADIN BALLOU.

Harvard, May 29, 1834.

Dear Sir,

It is with pleasure that I again address you, in reply to your letter; hoping, by my frequently writing now, to convince you more and more that my long silence has not been owing to a want of inclination, but to a lack of opportunity. I shall continue to speak to you plainly, and, I trust, respectfully and kindly; as one Christian friend should speak to another. My desire and aim are the glory of God, the prevalence of his truth, and the edification of his children.

You say, "It seems to be clear, either that the Restorationists are carrying things *too far*, or that their Unitarian brethren are not carrying them *far enough*. The time is at hand when this question must be decided."

My dear brother, you will not be surprised nor offended, when I frankly own to you, that it seems to me that the Restorationists are carrying things *too far*. To me they appear to go farther than the Scriptures authorize them to go. You say, "I am willing to concede that there are no passages of Scripture which declare, in so many unequivocal words, *All men will finally be restored to holiness and happiness*." You regard the doctrine as a "necessary *inference*." I have not supposed that it was necessary to draw such an inference from the instructions of the Bible. I think our time would be more wisely and profitably occupied if we attended to and insisted on those things, chiefly, which are clearly revealed to us in Scripture. When we pursue our inquiries beyond what is plainly written for our learning, we are apt to become dogmatical and sectarian, and to attach more importance to an opinion which has been the result of our own curious and refined speculation than to the obvious and simple doctrines of the gospel.

Christians in every age have been very prone to carry things *too far*. And a great deal of bitterness, strife, and division have been the consequences. Not contented with being disciples, they have aspired to be masters. Not satisfied with what is plain in the word of God, they have perplexed themselves and their brethren, and embroiled and rent the Church, and multiplied the enemies of religion, by attempting to pry into what is obscure and difficult. I grant that to desire to have a right understanding of the Scriptures is a laudable curiosity. But we must be aware that the Scriptures may suggest to us many inquiries to which they give no definite answer. It is so with other books—it is so with the book of nature. We should remember this, and check our curiosity when it is fixing our attention too deeply on things which are unimportant, or turning our thoughts away from things which are important. I suppose the gospel was designed to be a popular, a practical, a sanctifying, and a saving religion. The doctrines which it most concerns us to know, in order to our virtue, piety, and happiness, are few and simple, and are taught plainly and frequently.

I have thought that Unitarians, as a denomination, kept more strictly and closely on gospel ground than other denominations. You know the Orthodox charge them with not going far enough. We think we go as far as the Bible permits us, and that that is far enough. They who would have us receive the doctrines of the Trinity, native and total depravity, personal election, imputed righteousness, and imputed sin, etc., we think, would carry us too far. You, like us, reject these doctrines just mentioned. But then you would have us believe that all will be finally restored to holiness and happiness; and, consequently, that there will be another state of probation, or rather, another state of moral discipline, which will be successful in renovating, sanctifying, and saving all. We think these doctrines are neither expressly and directly taught in any particular passage of Scripture, nor with sufficient authority inferred from the general instruction of the New Testament. By making these, in our opinion, questionable points, distinguishing doctrines in your creed, you seem to us to carry things *too far*; to positively assert and frequently dwell on things, which the Scriptures but darkly hint at, or are quite silent about.

I mentioned the proneness of Christians in every age to go beyond the Scriptures. Unitarians have not been free from the same failing. Some of them have warmly advocated the Humanitarian scheme—some have warmly opposed it—some have zealously contended for the doctrine of philosophical necessity—some for materialism—some for the final restoration of all to holiness and happiness, etc.; as though these things were the most prominent and important. For my part, I could wish that these things could either be let alone, or handled with more moderation and prudence. Their tendency is to separate and bewilder us—to make religion too metaphysical and speculative to quicken the consciences and ex-

cite the piety of the learned, or to instruct the ignorant. The mind is busy in researches, in forming opinions, in drawing inferences, in inventing ingenious theories; and forgets to attend to the question, *What must I do to be saved?* Those, whose rare talents and great learning seem to point them out as guides and teachers to others, often leave the multitude as confused and darkened in their notions of religion as they found them. They exhibit the gospel to them in a form too subtile and refined to be intelligible and profitable to them. They tend rather to make men fond of debate, of subtile disquisitions, and of controversy, than penitent, humble, pious, and virtuous. I lament that there is so comparatively little attention paid to the moral and spiritual wants of mankind.

In my next letter, I intend to notice the passages of Scripture which you quote as proof of the doctrine that all will be finally restored to holiness and happiness. I would commence that subject now, were it not that some things occur to me which I am unwilling to omit or defer, and which will fill up the remaining page of this letter.

In many doctrines, I trust, we agree. We both receive the Scriptures as containing a revelation of the will of God to man—as our rule of faith and practice. We believe in the unity, power, wisdom, and goodness of God. We acknowledge Jesus to be the Christ, the Son of God, the Saviour of sinners, the Mediator between God and man. We both believe in a future state of retribution—that the good will be happy, and the wicked miserable while they continue to be wicked — that in order to be happy we must be holy. We both believe that the sinner must repent and reform, in order to be qualified for a heavenly state. I might proceed to mention many other things about which we entertain but little or no difference of opinion. Our disagreement is chiefly concerning a single doctrine. We agree that the sinful must become holy before they can be happy; and you say they all will become holy. We agree that the wicked will be punished or rendered miserable in proportion to their wickedness; our difference is in regard to the duration of their misery. You see we agree as to the *amount* of suffering, and differ as to the mode of it.—Perhaps you will say, Then why do you stand aloof from us, if our sentiments do in reality so nearly harmonize? It is because your form of the doctrine seems to us unscriptural. And why, my friend, need you make so much of a mode or form, which is not declared, in so many unequivocal words, in any passage of Scripture? How glad should I be, if, on serious and mature reflection, you should find you could conscientiously lay aside these distinctions, and combine and coöperate with us! United as one band of brothers, how much we could do to advance the cause of holiness and virtue, and to extend the influences of the gospel! While we are striving about these nice and difficult points, infidelity, atheism, and sin are all gaining ground. The ignorant remain without instruction, the young without a guide, the poor and afflicted without consolation. I am earnest for this union, not to swell the number of a party, not to insure us the mastery over an opposing sect, but to promote the moral and religious welfare of immortal beings. The Orthodox can do us but little harm, if we who call ourselves liberal are faithful to Christ. Multitudes are already disgusted with Orthodoxy in its various and shifting forms. They need to have the plain and practical doctrines impressed on their minds and on their hearts.

You are opposed to the Universalists. You think their peculiar opinions unscriptural, and injurious to the moral welfare of society. It has seemed to me that your insisting on the doctrine of a final restoration tended to increase the number of Universalists. At any rate, this, I believe, has often been the result, from the time of Origen till now. I think it of great importance that our attention should be fixed on those things which concern our peace and spiritual welfare. We have but little time to spend in curious speculations. We need it for other and nobler purposes. That God would grant us both that wisdom which will enable us to know the

way of truth and duty, and that strength which will enable us to walk in it, is the prayer of your friend and brother.

JONATHAN FARR.

A LETTER ON MORAL REFORM.

DEAR SIR,

Through your magazine I wish to lay before the public some plain thoughts on *Moral Reform*, together with a few of the facts which these thoughts rest upon. To many of your readers the term Moral Reform may be strange and without any very distinct sense. But I wish to use the phrase, as it is used now by a great many people, to mark the direct support given to the seventh commandment. In this use, to belong to a Moral-Reform Society and to be a Moral Reformer means making the vice of licentiousness a subject of consideration and action. To reclaim lewd men and women, and prevent others from becoming so, and save society from a desolation like that which was sent upon the ancient cities of the plain, is the business of Moral Reform, and of all those good men and true who are putting their hands to this new enterprise.

And now I ask, Can any man say why this subject should not be discussed, written upon, preached about, and made the object of associations, male and female? Does it not concern every father and mother to know, as near as can be known, what are the temptations whereunto their sons and daughters are exposed? Is any man putting forth the first-born son of his hopes to bustle among the crowds of a city, and will he not thank you and me could we say to him, "Here is a pitfall by the very wayside, and your son is carelessly passing by it, and will have to pass by it, at the risk of life, day after day and night upon night, so long as he remains here"? Still more, if this sin lieth in wait in the country as well as the city, will not the parent be thankful to those who speak right out about the matter, and tell the whole truth and let him know the worst, even if that should go to show that, in the peaceful village, where a perpetual Sabbath seems to reign in every heart,— that, even there, this temptation is busy with tremendous effect, and has a mighty power to blast the counsels of wisdom, and overthrow the very commands of revelation itself? Was not every father and every mother thankful to those men who forewarned them against the dangerous and subtle sin of drunkenness? And is not this other sin more dangerous and more subtle, as I know it is more destructive, than intemperance?

Heaven forbid I should exaggerate, by a hair's breadth, the amount of this vice! but it can, I honestly think, be shown, to the entire satisfaction of every candid person,—First, that the vice which caused the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrha is increasing rapidly upon us, and is now in a most alarming condition; —Second, that this vice is, above all other vices, treacherous and insinuating, "bringing butter in a lordly dish," as Jael did to Sisera; —Third, that by the attention and united effort of wise and Christian men the vice can be restrained and in some measure put down.

And I wish to invite the readers of "The Unitarian" to some consideration of the subject of Moral Reform, so far as I shall be able to treat it in subsequent Numbers.

H.

MONTHLY LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS,

JUST RECEIVED BY

JAMES MUNROE AND CO.

Naval Stories. By William Leggett.
The Life and Writings of the Rev. George Herbert.
Register of all Officers and Agents, Civil, Military, and Naval, in the Service of the United States, &c. Prepared at the Department of State. By William A. Weaver.
Youth Admonished, in a Brief View of our Lord's Parable of the Prodigal Son. By J. Thornton.
Missionary Voyages among the South Sea Islands.
Remarks on the Classical Education of Boys. By A Teacher.
Miriam Coffin, or the Whale-Fisherman. A Tale.
The Works of Mrs. Sherwood. Uniform Edition. Vol. 3.
Gregory's Mathematics for Practical Men.
A History of the United States. By George Bancroft. Vol. 1.
Statement of some New Principles on the subject of Political Economy. By John Rae.
Greenleaf's Reports. Vol. 8.
The Nun. By Mrs. Sherwood.
Speculation. A Novel. By the Author of "Traits and Traditions of Portugal."
Guy Rivers: A Tale of Georgia. By the Author of "Martin Faber."
Sketches of History, Life, and Manners in the West. By James Hall.

JAMES MUNROE & CO.

HAVE JUST RECEIVED FROM

THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION

THE FOLLOWING INVOICE OF

VALUABLE ENGLISH WORKS.

Unitarianism the Doctrine of the Gospel, by Lant Carpenter, 3d edition.
Farmer's Dissertation on Miracles, 3d edition.
Farmer's Essay on the Demoniacs of the N. Testament, 3d edition.
Priestley's Memoirs, with Observations on his Writings, by T. Cooper and W. Christie; and Four Posthumous Discourses, 2 vols.
Milton's Last Thoughts on the Trinity.
Bible Stories, Part 2d, containing Stories from the N. Testament, by S. Wood.
Price's Four Dissertations, 5th edition.
Belsham's Translation and Exposition of Paul's Epistles, with Notes, 4 vols.
Belsham's Memoirs of Lindsey, 2d edition.
Traité où l'on Expose ce que l'Ecriture nous apprend de la Divinité de Jésus Christ, par P. F. Le Courayer.
Cellérier's Discourse on the Authenticity and Divine Origin of the Old Testament, with Notes and Illustrations; translated from the French by J. R. Wreford.
Tagart on the Claims of Unitarian Christianity to the Respectful Consideration of the Reflecting Public.
Barker's Church-Establishment Anti-Christian, &c.
Harris's Harmony of Nature, Providence, and Christianity.
Review of Smith's Scripture Testimony to the Messiah.
Orthodoxy and Unbelief, by Ed. Higginson.
Joyce's Analysis of Paley's View of the Evidences of Christianity, 7th edition.
The Word made Flesh: A Sermon before the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, by W. Hincks.
Ashworth's Account of the Rise and Progress of the Unitarian Doctrine in the Societies at Rochdale, 2d edition.
Brief Dissertation on the Ministration of the Divine Word by Public Preaching, by Rob. Robinson.
Priestley's Unitarianism, Explained and Defended.
Priestley's Outline of the Evidences of Revealed Religion.
Lardner's Letter on the Logos.
Yates on the Unity of God.
Whyte's Sermons on Doctrinal and Practical Subjects, 2d edition.

JAMES MUNROE AND CO.

HAVE JUST PUBLISHED,

Ware's Life of the Saviour, *stereotype edition.*

Lowth's Isaiah, from the tenth English edition, carefully corrected and revised.

Stewart's Philosophy of the Human Mind. 8vo. 2d ed.

Briggs's Sermon at the Installation of Rev. A. B. Muzzey.

Wood's Discourse, on Gospel-Truths.

Two Discourses delivered before the First Parish in Cambridge, one, upon leaving the Old Meeting House, and the other, at the Dedication of the New. By William Newell, Pastor of the First Church in Cambridge.

Sunday-School and Parish Libraries will be promptly furnished, to order, on the most liberal terms.

Orders for any work published either in this country or in Europe will be attended to without delay.

The establishment of an hourly communication with the city, by coaches and baggage-wagons, enables us to assure distant customers of the execution of all orders transmitted by mail, with about the same despatch as can be had in Boston.

Liberal terms will be allowed to authors who may favour us with the publication of their works. No pains will be spared to bring out all books in good style and with despatch, and to give them extensive circulation.

Hilliard, Gray, and Gray, Printers, Cambridge.

David Lakes Jr.

Stanford Library
MAY 15 1945
B

THE

UNITARIAN.

Vol. I. No. 10.

OCTOBER, 1834.

CONDUCTED

BY BERNARD WHITMAN.

CAMBRIDGE:
JAMES MUNROE AND COMPANY.
BOSTON:
RUSSELL, ODIORNE, AND METCALF.
1834.

This number contains 2 sheets — Postage, under 100 miles, 3 cents — over 100 miles, 5 cents.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
Names	447
Means of Providing the Cure and Preventing the Spread of Infidelity.	454
An Essay on Liberality of Sentiment.	459
The Signs of the Times.	465
Letter addressed to Rev. L. W	475
Scripture Truth sufficiently Obvious.	482
Infidelity.	488
The Christian Denomination.	489

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Prayers for Children and Young Persons.	490

CORRESPONDENCE AND INTELLIGENCE.

Fourth Letter to the Rev. Adin Ballou.	492

THE UNITARIAN is issued in monthly numbers, by JAMES MUNROE and Co., *Cambridge, Mass.* Each number will contain, on an average, 48 pages royal 12mo., [i. e. octavo size], and be printed on good paper and with handsome type. The price will be two dollars per annum, payable on the first of March. To those who procure and become responsible for six subscribers a seventh copy will be furnished *gratis*. The usual discount to Agents. All business letters to be addressed to the publishers.

☞ Our Subscribers are reminded that payment became due on the receipt of the March number. Gentlemen to whom subscription-papers were sent are respectfully requested to collect and forward to the publishers, James Munroe & Co., Cambridge, Mass., the amount due from the several subscribers whose names they have sent us.

It is particularly requested of our subscribers to make their payments in Massachusetts' or United States' Bank Notes; since the discount on all other bills involves a considerable loss.

It is intended to notice all the books and pamphlets which may be received, so far as they fall within the plan of this work. It is, therefore, respectfully requested of authors and publishers to forward copies of such publications.

The Editor will hold himself responsible for no articles except his own.

This Day Published,

BY

JAMES MUNROE & CO.,

Booksellers to the University.

Views of Christian Truth, Piety, and Morality, selected from the Writings of Dr. Priestley, with an Introductory Notice of his Life and Character. By Rev. Henry Ware, Jr.

Volume III. of Ware's Sunday Library, being *The Holy Land and its Inhabitants.* By Rev. S. G. Bulfinch, of Augusta, Georgia. Illustrated by a Map of Judea.

Cambridge, June 1, 1834.

THE UNITARIAN.

Vol. I. OCTOBER 1, 1834. No. 10.

Names.

Among those who maintain the strict personal Unity of God, there are many varieties of designation. The terms Unitarian, Liberal Christian, Socinian, Arian, Humanitarian, Christian, Bible-Christian, Hicksite, Congregationalist and Independent, have been applied either to distinct portions, or to the general mass of those who reject the doctrine of the Trinity. It may be regarded as a matter of little importance that there should be these varieties of name; and could we be so confident in our own wisdom as to be certain that mere words would never assume among us a consequence which does not belong to them, we need trouble ourselves little about the matter. This confidence however we cannot have, when we contemplate the history of opinions in past times, or when we look at the present condition of the Christian world. When names have long been worn, they are valued, they are fought for, and even when differences of opinion have ceased to exist, differences of name will produce or keep alive a spirit of dissension. The remarks which follow may show, that it is possible other evils, still more serious, may result from the adoption, on our part, of a wrong name, or even the application of the right name in a wrong manner.

We may briefly dismiss from consideration the name *Socinian*. If it was ever the proper designation of a party, it is so no longer, since the distinguishing doctrine of Socinus, —the duty of praying to Christ,—has not been maintained.

among modern defenders of the divine personal unity. We have other strong reasons against this designation. It is borrowed from a human leader, and therefore not suitable for any who remember the precept of Christ to call no man master upon earth. It tends besides to give the impression that our distinguishing tenet was never maintained till the days of Socinus; an impresssion utterly incorrect, as every opponent must allow, who has ever heard of Arius and the council of Nice. And lastly, the very attempt to force this name upon us, as a term of obloquy, was a sufficient reason for the resistance made on the part of our predecessors to its imposition.

The term *Liberal Christian* has been adopted by many, and among them by some of the most respected of our brethren. There are others, however, to whose views this designation could never be reconciled. To them it sometimes grates harshly on the ear, as too assuming; at other times it seems too near akin to the unenviable titles of Rationalist, Latitudinarian, and Free-thinker. In what sense do we call ourselves liberal? The meaning of "munificent" is of course excluded. Do we then, by this term claim to be charitable in our judgment of others? If we are so, it is well; but would it not be desirable that the world should discover the fact for themselves, without our announcing it? The meaning intended must be, that our sentiments are such as correspond with, and spring from, elevated and enlarged views of God and his creation. We undoubtedly think that this is the case;—unhappily our opponents are of a different opinion. Why then should we adopt a name, our right to which can never be admitted by any except our own party? Those who differ from us sometimes call themselves evangelical; and no doubt they are as firmly persuaded that such is the character of their doctrines, as we are that our sentiments are liberal. Is not the adoption of such titles on either side, in bad taste, to say the least?

It appears that the only appropriate application of the term *liberal*, would be to that great section of the church, whose aim is to investigate and improve; a party which, excluding the Catholics and the high Calvinists, would embrace most other denominations of the Christian world.

If the term *Liberal Christian* be objectionable, as the name of a sect, because it claims too much, the term *Christian*, if assumed without explanation, would be still more so. This designation has been adopted by thousands of our breth-

ren, from an unwillingness to take any party name. They did not mean to imply that others were not equally entitled to the name of Christians,—nor did they mean to have the first syllable of the word, when applied to them, drawn out long, or the *i* of the second syllable changed into a *y* (Christ-yans.) All they meant was, to disclaim sectarian names, and own no master but Christ. Their amiable wish has not however been crowned with success. Their name has been made a sectarian one in spite of themselves,—is barbarously pronounced, and barbarously spelt,—and, worst of all, exposes them to the undeserved imputation of arrogance and exclusiveness, unless every time they pronounce it to a stranger, it is accompanied with a long explanation, not perhaps intelligible to all.

To obviate some of these inconveniences, the term *Bible Christian* is occasionally applied to the "Christian Connexion," by themselves and others, at least in the Southern States. But this title is, in another point of view, still more objectionable than those already mentioned, as even those who assume it must admit that their Trinitarian neighbours are not deficient in respect for the Bible.

We are not aware whether the name *Hicksite* is recognised by that respectable portion of the Society of Friends, to whom it is applied by others. Such a designation would be unfortunate, as derived from the name of a human leader, and as not in itself characteristic of the faith of those to whom it is applied.

The name *Humanitarian* appears to be unobjectionable as a designation of that particular class among us, who do not believe in the preëxistence of our Saviour. The term *Arian*, as applied to those who admit the preëxistence, might be excepted against, as derived from a human leader, some of whose views, besides, have no supporters at the present day. Still the name is an old and a highly respectable one,—nor has any yet been found on the whole preferable, for the sole purpose to which this should now be applied,—that of designating a branch among the believers in the personal unity of God.

But for those believers at large, no name seems so suitable on every account, as *Unitarian*. It expresses distinctly the one great principle which we all maintain, and it expresses nothing more. It presents no claims which any candid opponent need hesitate a moment to admit. Here, perhaps, we may be met with the objection which has been often ex-

pressed, that other Christians are Unitarians as well as we, because they too believe in the unity of God. It cannot be doubted that they who make this objection are sincere. They suppose that we use the word *Unitarian* as synonymous with *Monotheist*, thus styling ourselves, believers in one God, and of course implying that our opponents believe in more Gods than one. A few words will suffice to set this matter in its true light.

"Unitarian," we have heard it said, "means, a believer in one God. Those consequently who assume this title, charge upon others a faith in more Gods than one. They thus arrogate for themselves a name which belongs equally to all Christians, and in such a manner as to accuse Orthodox believers of polytheism." This view of the subject was expressed, though not in these very words, in a dedication sermon preached about four years since, by a highly esteemed Episcopalian clergyman of Boston, now no more. We disclaim, however, the meaning thus charged upon us. We believe, indeed, that our brethren who differ from us, hold sentiments not properly reconcilable with the unity of God; but to say, or imply that they believe in more Gods than one, would be as inconsistent with fact, as with Christian charity. Though they deny the unity of person, they admit and strongly maintain a unity of being in the Supreme. The moment we can convince them that other parts of their system are inconsistent with this unity of being, that moment they are converted to our side;—if not, the ground of controversy would then be changed, and we should argue against them as indeed, blinded polytheists. In such a light, no candid Unitarian can now regard them, for they, as well as we, maintain that God is One.

Nor does the name we assume imply so grave a charge against our brethren. We deny the first assertion quoted above. Unitarian does not mean "a believer in one God," —certainly not unless Trinitarian means "a believer in three Gods." That such is not the signification of either term is evident from the fact that our opponents bear willingly the name of Trinitarian. The two words are precisely analogous in their derivation; nor does any name or title of the Supreme Being enter into the composition of either. As used among Christians, the word Trinitarian must indeed designate a believer in three, and the word Unitarian, a believer in one; but the well known state of the controversy between us shows clearly enough to what these numbers refer. There is no ques-

tion between us as to the unity of being in the Supreme, but while other Christians maintain that the one God exists in three persons, hypostases, or distinctions, we hold that no such division has place in his nature. The subject at issue being thus stated, it is obvious that Trinitarian properly expresses the belief of our opponents in the existence of three persons in one God, while the corresponding term, as used by us, denotes a believer in One Divine Person only.

The name Unitarian then, marks our distinctive doctrine,—marks no more than this,—and this in a manner which cannot give to any one reasonable ground of offence. It is then the proper and correct designation of our doctrines, and of us as their supporters.

But it may still be doubted whether this be the most proper designation for our congregations or our churches. Few practical objections perhaps exist against it at present, but when we regard the future, when we remember the spirit of comprehensive liberality on which it is desirable that all our institutions should be established, we may see reason to wish that the time might come when sectarian distinctions would no longer be applied to communities of believers, but employed simply to designate the forms and grades of belief among individuals. How this object is attainable, in the present age, may perhaps be doubted, and each religious society must decide as to the propriety of contributing by its example to promote that object. We are however persuaded that if ever unity of feeling is to be restored among Christians, it must be in part by the adoption of the principle which we now proceed to illustrate.

That principle is, that names expressive of sectarian distinctions, should be applied to individuals merely, and to such associations of individuals as are wholly voluntary, but not to our churches and congregations. We may exemplify the idea by pointing to those places of worship in the erection of which several denominations have united, as the mariners' churches in our sea-port towns, and some houses of prayer in thinly-settled districts of country. Such a church is called by no sectarian name. Within its walls the Baptist, the Methodist, the Presbyterian are equally at home. Yet the individuals who attend worship there do not give up their differences of opinion, nor do they, as individuals, refuse to be called by those names which properly designate their belief; but in the house of God they meet on common ground, and the worship that ascends from thence to heaven, is the worship not of a sect distinguished by the badge of a name from other sects, but of Christians, disciples of Jesus Christ.

Is it considered a matter of impossibility that this union of spirit and worship should exist among those whose opinions differ? The institutions which the wise and pious settlers of New England established, and under whose fostering influences religion attained that form which we regard as its truest and purest, furnish an answer in the negative. The name they gave to their churches was *congregational;* a name which marks, not the sentiments of those who preach or those who hear, but the simple fact that each congregation has entire control of its own affairs. The creeds, or terms of membership of some among those churches, show that the liberality of their founders was consistent; expressing only the plainest, most generally admitted principles of Christian truth. In a church thus constituted, the follower of all the deep speculations of Calvin sat side by side with the disciple of the milder Arminius. Had a Christian entered, who reverenced the authority of either the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Patriarch of Constantinople, or the Pope of Rome, without wishing to impose that authority on others, he would have nothing in the creed of the church to which he could refuse his assent, nothing in its name of Congregational, but an announcement of the fact that the worshipping assembly enacted and enforced for itself its own simple regulations.

In churches thus constituted, liberal feelings naturally prevailed; and as full freedom was given to religious inquiry, enlarged views were taken of providence and of revelation. Thus it was that Unitarian principles gained ground first in New England. But what then was the conduct of the fathers of our faith? Did they give up the congregational name, and narrow the creeds of their churches, so as to exclude all who held Trinitarian or Calvinistic sentiments? No. Far from it. They feared not, and scrupled not, to be called as individuals, by the name which properly expressed their sentiments, the name of Unitarians; they scrupled not to combine, as Unitarians, for the diffusion of the sentiments they held. But they changed not the liberal institutions of their churches, leaving the coming generation unembarrased with a sectarian name, and thus preserving in a great degree, the peace of their congregations, amid the storm of controversy with which they were assailed.

Would that the same liberal course were pursued in all our rising churches! It would secure the right of our brethren, now and always, to form their own opinions, and to correct them as they might see cause; it would give to following genera-

tions liberty of choice between conflicting sentiments; it would give them liberty to be Christians if they desired it, without pledging themselves to the formulas of any sect. One of the strongest obstacles which a young person has to encounter, in publicly acknowledging the obligations of religion, is the fact that such an acknowledgment must identify him with the supporters of some creed, in such a manner as to preclude or render unpleasant, subsequent changes of opinion. Had churches never taken any other name than Christian, this difficulty would not have existed; for then, whatever in any case might be the sentiments of the pastor, or of the congregation in general, and however boldly on proper occasions they might be expressed, no communicant would regard himself as fettered by those sentiments, or in the smallest degree accountable for them. But let your terms of communion be the most liberal conceivable, yet if the church is distinguished by a title derived from the opinions of a sect, to the opinions of that sect every one who unites with such a church will be considered as bound.

While then, we retain as individuals the name Unitarian, which properly marks our sentiments, let our congregations, and our places of worship be designated as Congregational or Independent, or, better still, bear simply the name of Christian. And in desiring that such might be universally the case, we are influenced by views of the future perhaps far distant. Believing that our sentiments are correct, we believe they will triumph. We believe that Unitarians will at length outnumber all other sects of Christians in our lands. And so much does history show of the danger of prosperity to the purity and Christian spirit of religious denominations, that we fear for ourselves, when that ascendancy shall have been attained. Let us not then have our places of public worship identified with the sects which occupy them. Let our congregations be left unfettered, even by a name. Let them be so constituted that, even where Unitarian sentiments are now most constantly preached, the next generation may, if they see fit, return to Trinitarianism without finding a single external obstacle to oppose the change. As long as the name Unitarian is spoken against, and the sentiments it represents are misunderstood and controverted, let those who maintain those sentiments bear the name, steadfastly, unyieldingly, and without a thought of retreat or of compromise; but when its hour of triumph comes,—and come it will,—then let not that name be dishonoured as the battle-cry of a mere worldly contest for political power, or the

spell of intolerance and bigotry. No. Then let the name be heard no more, as the designation of a place of worship, or of an organized sect. Then let the powerful majority, by dropping the use of its past appellation, amalgamate with itself in feeling those who yet remain divided from it in opinion, and no name but that of Christian be known in the temples raised to the honour of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

S. G. Bulfinch.

Means of Providing the Cure and Preventing the Spread of Infidelity.

[Concluded from page 421.]

We proceed to our last topic and inquire, 1. What means for preventing the spread of Infidelity are suggested by a consideration of the personal power of the Christian. We speak here of the direct influence exerted by the mind of the Christian over the mind of the Infidel. In the exertion of that influence in what light shall the Infidel be regarded? As Philanthropists we are to engage in a work of love, as Philanthropists we are to look upon the Infidel in the light not so much of a guilty as of an unfortunate being. *All* moral evil, so far as we are called on to act in regard to it, should be considered rather in the light of a misfortune than in that of a sin. We stand not here or anywhere as the judges of men, it is not our special duty here or anywhere to guage and measure the depth of irreligion and crimes, to pass sentence on those ill-deserts which Omniscience alone can estimate, and Infinite Justice alone consider rightly. So far as we do consider the sinfulness of any course of conduct or set of principles we are to consider it in reference entirely to the further object of our benevolent action. Moreover we are to *regard and treat* the Infidel as a friend, a brother, and an equal. We are not to speak in the tone of spiritual authority, we are not to assume the air of chosen champions for defending the laws of God. We are not to appear as if occupying any fancied eminence of virtue, but, in the expression already used, we are to stand towards the Infidel in the relation of friends, of brothers, of equals. We desire to insist upon this,—there has been so much Infidelity created and so much Infidelity confirmed by a course of treatment the opposite to that of which we are speaking.

Still further that influence of the Christian upon the Infidel mind, which is to be most efficient, is the influence of direct personal communication from individual to individual. This direct action between the minds of believers and those of unbelievers is at once the most obvious, the most powerful and the most neglected of all the means of counteracting Infidelity. This moral power of the living conscience is the most irresistible of all powers. There is no baseness of degradation that can shield itself, if it would, from the influence of that lofty holiness of the breathing man, which is brought to act through deep sympathy upon it. The uneasy conscience of the wretched sinner directs his eye even against his will to the high example. There is a charm in it which he cannot resist, —a spell binds all his faculties as if his probation were about to be ended,—his power of choice and action taken away,—and as if that conscience which he has been deadening in the low pursuits of the world, and searing in the heat of his own fiery passions, were already commencing those torments which must punish the ill-spent life.—The action of such a lofty mind upon the feelings of the sinner may be regarded as virtually a rebuke and sentence upon sin,—as the decision of a voiceless tribunal premonitory of that future sentence of threatened condemnation which a higher tribunal will pronounce. Oh,—that this first decision might more frequently avert the last! "Without the Law," says Paul, "sin was dead." Now this direct influence of the Christian's mind embodies the Law, and gives it fresh life and a double energy. And because the Law is not applied to their hearts in this living shape, sin is dead in thousands. By such influence upon the mind of the spiritual Infidel the revelation is made to fall upon it like a burning light, and to scatter the mists of self-deception.

We have no doubt that these suggestions as to the spirit in which we should undertake this great work will meet the views of society, yet in order that the path of duty in a matter so important may be as plain before us as possible, perhaps we may be permitted to speak very briefly of the consequences that result when that work is carried on in a different temper,—when Christians leave Unbelievers entirely to themselves, open upon them their battery of argument and reproach from a distance, and seem to determine that whether they live or die they shall live or die under the Infidel standard. What are the consequences, then, of this spirit and this action in regard to Unbelievers as a body and as individuals?

1. How will Infidels be affected as a body? Let the higher orders of society, let the great mass of respectable men withdraw from any particular class of the community, and that class is of course thrown back from all other classes upon itself. The individuals which compose it strengthen each other in their common character and common pursuits with a common sympathy, especially, if, in addition to this line of division between the public generally and these despised men, they are attacked with persecution and reproach, they will be compressed into a systematic, thoroughly organized, and thoroughly disciplined company, a company ever strengthening itself with new accessions by means of that sympathy which real distresses and just complaints have occasioned.—Now the Infidels of the present day and especially in this country, are such that by their own energy they could never come to constitute a consistent and solid phalanx arrayed against Christianity. The congregation of the Infidel preacher would *naturally* be even more than now a floating, unsteady, unsympathetic congregation. But if Christians, instead of opposing Infidels as a body, and compelling them to defend themselves in a body, would act upon them by that individual influence which we have recommended, and not as disputatious partisans, but as the kindest of friends, Unbelief, having in itself no essential unity of character and strength, would be resolved into its original elements, the junction of its parts would be completely destroyed, and we might hope that private labour and private love would shortly succeed in checking its progress. There would be no *armies* of Infidelity to attack if the only weapons used by Christians were "the sword of the Spirit and the shield of Faith and the helmet of Salvation."—Infidelity must be a cold unsocial thing to every man's feelings, for it is adapted to no man's nature. With this icy weight at their bosoms men surely cannot feel any the more inclined to gladden each other's hearts in the full gush of a mutual sympathy. Unbelievers may rejoice in each other's sympathy when they are the objects of a fiery persecution,—but that they can bring each the solitary dissatisfaction of his own heart, each the rebuke of his own conscience, the thwarting of his own desires, the calling down of his own soul from a heavenly hope and a heavenly flight to a narrow place opened in the soil of this dim and narrow earth, each his extinction of every bright image of the past and glorious vision of futurity in the darkness of that narrow place,—that they can regard all these things as presenting a fit occasion for the joy of their mutual sympathy,—that they can rejoice greatly in the conviction that they

have but a few days to rejoice in, we cannot force ourselves to believe. Infidels cannot congratulate each other that they are Infidels. They may have a reciprocal delight in their mutual support of each other against what they regard as a common foe, they may congratulate each other that priestcraft, as they call it, vainly strives to fix its fetters upon them,—they may mutually rejoice that they have spurned from them those whom they regard as the tyrants of the human mind,—but they cannot feel and express a mutual joy that they have rejected every principle of a religious *faith*,—and if the the course recommended be pursued *most surely* these other occasions of joy will be taken *from* them. Infidelity is not satisfied with itself. It would not be revealed to itself. It glories in what it is not, and is ashamed of what it is. It loathes its own deformity. These remarks of course do not apply to all Infidelity. They would come near to having this universal application were Christianity perfectly free from corruptions in the minds and lives of her advocates, and were her doctrines rationally promulgated to the world. Infidelity and vice would then, in Christian lands, be nearly synonymous terms. For another reason Infidelity would not naturally possess the strength of united action against Christianity. There are devoted to its support none or very few of those master-spirits, those examples of intellectual and moral glory, which give strength and consistency to any cause. There are certainly no great lights before which those of other men "stand still." Christianity has risen to the loftiest rank of mind, and is extending her power down through every gradation of intellect and character to the lowest. She is every moment raising sinners from the mire of sensuality into her heavenly light. Infidelity has the highest region of her intellect in a comparatively low and dark place and she is constantly descending. Christianity made truly pure and truly rational would always and in every place check her triumphs.

2. We can say but a word of the effect which a spirit of reproach and persecution displayed by the Christian must have on the unbeliever as an individual. We may however describe it briefly in remarking that it keeps him in unbelief. Such a spirit only gives greater activity to those internal *causes* of unbelief which consist in bad passions and perverted judgments of truth. The object should be to give the predominance to his high principles and noble affections. Moreover we compel him to regard us as enemies. Loud and frequent as declarations of real friendship and good-will may

be, with such a spirit we shall appear to him as enemies. In such a case good professions are but reacting forces. The consequence of course will be to increase his hostility towards us, our brethren, and the cause we mutually support. But with the opposite spirit we should have an opposite result. Christian Intellect made active and powerful by Christian Love, addressing its appeal to the highest capacities and best affections of every opposer of the Christian Faith, must disperse the darkness from every Infidel's mind as mists are scattered before the morning sun. Christianity thus made operative becomes self-luminous. Like a pure and strong conscience it bears its testimony in itself. And if it go forth thus to enlighten and cheer the world, no man can escape its radiance, no man can pluck it from its sphere. What then is the sum of that which by our personal action *we* are to do *against* Infidelity and *for* the Infidel? What is the motto by which we should guide ourselves in contending for "the Faith once delivered to the Saints." Permit us to propose the following,—Personal Holiness, Religious Activity, Christian Love.

1. Could there have been any doubt as to the first of these qualities we should have already spoken of it, not only particularly, but above and almost in exclusion of all things else. If the corruptions of Christianity make *some* Infidels, the corruptions of the Christian make *more*. Christianity rests on the holiness of her advocates. Take this away and her walls crumble and her empire declines. Would any one so exert his strength, as to strike at Infidelity the deadliest blow in his power. Let him increase the virtue of his own soul.

2. Yet our holiness must have in outward nativity an expression of its inward life. Christian intellect and Christian goodness unfelt by the world, so far as the world is concerned, are nothing but unapplied powers; they are like undiscovered principles in nature. To us the direction to be active comes with emphasis. We have something to say on the question whether our particular faith, whether Unitarianism is to be anything more than an idea, a principle, an abstraction, a scheme. May our lives answer it rightly.

3. Yet, lastly, this activity must be prompted and attended, it must be assisted and sanctified, it must be made powerful and acceptable, by deep Christian sympathy and love.—Let us consider then,

1. That, in the treatment of Infidelity, violent means used as remedies serve only to confirm the disease which has fast-

ened on the intellectual and moral nature, and let us therefore regard the work of defending Christianity against the attacks of Unbelievers as a work, not of war, but of love.

2. That, while it is unjust and unwise to denounce in general terms the doctrines of any Christian sect as corrupt and productive of Infidelity; and that, as we find, in the corruptions of Christianity and in its irrational application to the souls of men, fundamental causes of unbelief, let us expend our most anxious efforts for their removal.

3. That the advocates of Unitarianism have not yet made such wise application of *their* principles to the souls of men as to reveal to the world the intrinsic excellence of their faith.

4. That personal communion in the true spirit of Christian kindness between the mind of the Believer and the mind of the Infidel is the great means of removing the Infidelity which already exists. C. A. Bartol.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE UNITARIAN.

Dear Sir,

The following Essay written in the year 1734, by the late Robert Robinson of Cambridge, England (a writer but little known in this country I believe), is so much in accordance with the spirit, design, and tendency of the Unitarian, that your readers, I presume, can scarcely fail to be pleased and profited by the perusal. Through the whole of his laborious and useful life, amidst good report and evil report, he was the staunch, unflinching friend, the fearless and uncompromising advocate of *constitutional freedom*, civil and religious. Liberality in religion, is, even now, but little understood and practised. On this subject, therefore, we need "line upon line, and precept upon precept." It cannot be too often brought before us, it cannot be too deeply impressed on our minds. M. Harding.

An Essay on Liberality of Sentiment.

Books, like men, have a temper, and books of this kind should be good tempered; they then conciliate esteem, and like a well-bred man, give no offence; perhaps always com-

municate pleasure. It was said of Queen Mary, that she was a good tempered lady of an ill tempered religion. Pity anyone should discover sour, morose tempers, who profess a religion all founded and finished in love; I wish, for the sake of justice as well as general utility, this publication may always exemplify liberality of sentiment.*

By sentiment I mean *opinion*, and particularly religious opinion; the notion, idea, or judgment we form of the body of religion in the whole, or any of the parts that compose it. By *liberality* I mean *generosity*, which, strictly speaking, rather accompanies sentiment than goes into the nature and essence of it. It would be speaking more accurately to say, such a man is a person whose religious sentiments are accompanied with a liberality and generosity of heart towards others, who do not adopt his sentiments, than to say in a vague manner, such a person is of liberal sentiments. This is too general, and I will explain myself.

A man of liberal sentiments must be distinguished from him, who hath no *religious sentiments at all*. Nothing is more common than to meet with people, who have never turned their attention to religion. Whether it be owing to the natural littleness of the mind, or to the neglect of education, or to the gratifying of our passions, to the company we keep, the occupation we follow, or the vain prospects of future enjoyments in life, or to any other cause, the fact is too well established. The Archbishop of Cambray somewhere resembles such a person to a man in distress for money, who would go into a room, receive, and reckon, and enjoy a large sum, without being able to tell, after he came out, any thing about the dimensions or the decorations of the room. The money, the money, the object of all his hopes and fears, had filled all the capacity of his little soul, so many men enter into the world and quit it. Let them rather blush for not being able to tell whether there be a God, or whether he have spoken, or what he hath said to mankind.

The man I mean to commend, is the man of sentiment. He hath seriously and effectually investigated, both in his Bible and on his knees, in public assemblies, and in private conversations, the important articles of religion. He hath laid down principles, he hath inferred consequences; in a word, he hath adopted sentiments of his own. Nor let us

* This Essay was published in the first number of the Theological Magazine, an old work and long out of print.

confound the man of liberal sentiments, with that tame, undiscerning domestic among good people, who, though he has sentiments of his own, yet has not judgment to estimate the worth and value of one sentiment beyond another. Two truths equally clear, may not be of equal dignity and importance. Can the posture in which I address God, suppose it scriptural, be as important as the temper in which I pray to him? People of this class divide into two parts, the one have no essentials, and the other no circumstantials in religion. The man who would conceal this ignorance and indifference under pretence of liberality of sentiment, resembles Solomon's idiot, and says "one event happeneth to the clean and to the unclean; as is the good, so is the sinner; and he that sweareth, as he that feareth an oath." Out of the hive of those, who have no circumstantials, the objects of toleration in religion, come a third class, who indeed have sentiments, and just sentiments, but who hold them in the unrighteous dispositions of censure, slander, and persecutions. Morose and fierce as a stormy winter day, their aspect lours, and all their efforts damage the humble traveller, whose rusty cloak seems to him a nobler gift of God than all the mighty powers that endanger his comfort and his life. A generous soul will not only abstain from injuring the innocent, plundering the widow, and pillaging the orphan, but, to use a fine expression of a prophet, he will *despise* the gain of oppression, *shake his hands* from holding of bribes, *stop his ears* from hearing of blood, and *shut his eyes* from seeing evil. What can a fierce believer reply to a modest Christian uttering such a soliloquy as this? You have a fine genius; but you persecute me! You are sound in the faith; but your faith or your something works hatred to me! You are an eloquent orator; but you slander me! You sing with harmony, and pray with energy; but you increase your felicity by crucifying me. Think seriously, would the King of kings, your Lord and mine, pattern of every good work; would he treat me thus? And would you wish he should conduct himself to you, as you do to me? The man of liberal sentiments, is supposed to be of the sentiments of Jesus Christ, and in Jesus Christ there are two admirable perfections, the one extensive power, the other the kindest and most gentle use of it.

We should extend this subject to an improper length, were we to describe the exercise of liberality of sentiment, and enforce it by arguments. A sketch, then shall serve.

A generous believer of the Christian religion, in whole or

in part, will never allow himself to try to propagate his sentiments by the commission of sin. No collusion, no bitterness, no wrath, no undue influence of any kind, will he apply to make his sentiments receivable; no living thing will be less happy for his being a Christian; he will exercise his liberality by allowing those who differ from him as much virtue and integrity as he possibly can. He will say, have I read the Scriptures? so have they. Have I set God always before me? so have they. Do I act up to my best light? so do they. Are they fallible? so am I. Have they prejudices and passions? so have I. Have we both one master and are we fellow servants; and must we all give an account to the Judge of the world of the deeds done in the body? The wisest and the best way then is, to render the present life happy by agreeing where we can, and, where we cannot, by agreeing to differ.

There are, among a multitude of arguments to enforce such a disposition, the following worth our attention.

I. We should exercise liberality in union with sentiments because of the different *capacities*, *advantages*, and *tasks* of mankind. Religion employs the capacities of mankind, just as the air employs their lungs and their organs of speech. The fancy of one is lively, of another dull. The judgment of one is elastic, of another feeble, a damaged spring. The memory of one is retentive; that of another treacherous, as the wind. The passions of this man are lofty, vigorous rapid; those of that man cruel, and hum and buz, and when on the wing, sail only round the circumference of a tulip. Is it conceivable that capability so different in every thing else, should be all alike in religion? The *advantages* of mankind differ. How should he who hath no parents, no books, no tutor, no companions, equal him whom Providence hath gratified with them all? Who, when he looks over the treasures of his own knowledge, can say, this I had of a Greek, that I learned of a Roman, this information I acquired of my tutor, that was a present of my father; a friend gave me this branch of knowledge, an acquaintance bequeathed me that.—The tasks of mankind differ, so I call the employments and exercises of life. In my opinion circumstances make great men; and if we have not Cæsars in the state, and Pauls in the church, it is because neither church nor state are in the circumstances in which they were in the days of those great men. Push a dull man into a river, and endanger his life, and suddenly he will discover invention, and make efforts beyond himself. The world is a fine school of instruction. Poverty,

sickness, pain, loss of children, treachery of friends, malice of enemies, and a thousand other things drive the man of sentiments to his Bible, and, so to speak, bring him home to a repast with his benefactor, God. Is it conceivable that he, whose young and tender heart is yet all unpractised in trials of this kind, can have ascertained and tasted so many religious truths as the sufferer has?

II. We should exercise liberality along with our sentiments, because of the *depravities* as well as imperfections of mankind. The patrons of error and vice have known mankind too well to hazard the cause of sin undisguised, and in its native form. Is there a crime without an apologist, or one disgraceful action without a specious name? Is immorality any thing more than fashion? Is not deism genius, and blasphemy spirit and courage? O the godly pretences of error, the plausible pretexts of sin! How should a youth born in the lap of error, nourished and cherished with her milk, surrounded with people all in error like himself, where everything is in disguise, how should he, if his heart be depraved, how should he resist magic so full of charms! Depraved mankind! instead of persecuting you for embracing only five out of five thousand truths of religion, I will pity and esteem you, and adore the grace that emboldens you to admit the five; "you may be saved, yet so as by fire." Had I, depraved like you, perhaps more than you, had I been so powerfully attacked by error, I might not have been saved at all.

We should believe the Christian religion with liberality, in the third place, because, *every part of the Christian religion inculcates generosity.* Christianity gives us a character of God! what a character does it give, God is love; Christianity teaches the doctrine of providence; but what a providence! *Upon whom doth not its light arise!* Is there an animalcule so little, or a wretch so forlorn, as to be forsaken and forgotten of his God? Christianity teaches the doctrine of redemption; but the redemption of whom? Of all tongues, kindred, nations, and people; of the infant of a span, and the sinner of a hundred years old: a redemption generous in its principle, generous in its price, generous in its effects, fixed sentiments of divine munificence, and revealed with a liberality, for which we have no name. In a word, the illiberal Christian always acts contrary to the spirit of his religion; the liberal man alone thoroughly understands it.

IV. We should be liberal, because no other spirit is *exemplified* in the infallible guides, whom we profess to follow, I

set one Paul against a whole array of uninspired men. Some preach Christ of good will, and some of envy and strife. What then? Christ is preached, and I therein do rejoice, yea and will rejoice. One eateth all things, another eateth herbs; but why dost THOU judge thy brother? "We shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ." We often inquire, what was the doctrine of Christ, and what was the practice of Christ: suppose we were to institute a third question, of what TEMPER was Christ?

Once more: We should be liberal as well as orthodox, because truth, especially the truths of Christianity, *do not want any supports* from our illiberality. Let the little bee guard its little honey with its little sting; perhaps its little life may depend a little while on that little nourishment. Let the fierce bull shake his head, and nod his horn, and threaten his enemy, who seeks to eat his flesh, and wear his coat, and live by his death, poor fellow! his life is in danger; I forgive his bellowing and his rage. But the Christian religion, is that in danger? and what human efforts can render that true which is false, that odious which is lovely? Christianity is in no danger, and therefore it gives its professor life, and breath, and all things, except a power of injuring others. They who have such powers, and have incorporated them with Christianity, have derived them from some other cause, for *the wisdom that is from above is pure, peaceable, gentle,* firm as a rock, and so to speak, defies the unavailing rage of surrounding waves.

In fine: Liberality in the profession of religion is a *wise and innocent policy.* The bigot lives at home; a reptile he crawled into existence, and there in his hole he lurks a reptile still. A generous Christian goes out of his own party, associates with others, and gains improvement by all. The pride of some Christians is so great, that they cannot conceive there should be anything true, which they do not understand, or anything excellent which they do not possess. They cannot bear contradiction, and, conceiving themselves as models of religion, they judge of the perfection of others by the proportion they bear to themselves. So near me, so near orthodoxy; so much like me, so much like what a man ought to be; so many features of me, so much the resemblance of Jesus Christ. *O heart of man! deceitful above all things and desperately wicked! who can know thee?* It is a Persian proverb; *A liberal hand is better than a strong arm.* The dignity of Christianity is better supported by acts of liberality, than by accuracy of reasoning: but when both go to-

gether, when a man of sentiment can clearly state, and ably defend his religious principles, and when his heart is as generous as his principles are inflexible, he possesses strength and beauty in an eminent degree. May God of his infinite mercy diffuse a rich abundance of his spirit among all good men.

The Signs of the Times.

Recent events, which have occurred on either side of us, seem to me to demand the sober consideration of every friend of Christian liberty, of good order, of our free institutions. They involve principles of far-reaching extent, connected with the best interests of man. They are scarcely I think to be considered as transient, momentary bursts of popular feeling, suddenly stirred from its depths, and as suddenly to subside. They indicate too plainly a sad deficiency of high-minded principle in the great mass of the community, and a very lax way of viewing such outrages, among a portion of it who might well be supposed to regard them more justly, which to my own mind is alarming beyond measure. If such things are to be looked upon calmly, and much more complacently,—if the example set in one place, in reference to one object of hatred or vengeance, is to be followed at once in others, in regard to other objects, and there shall be found those everywhere, who, occupying respectable stations in society, shall permit their prejudices to blind their sober judgment, and make them virtually side with the mob either in opinion or action, then farewell to our boasted freedom of thought, and word, and deed. We are fast preparing ourselves to wear heavier chains than ever British power dreamed of forging.

I do not indeed fear that things are to reach this horrible extremity. I trust under the good Providence of God, that public virtue and Christian principle enough remain amongst us, once roused to energetic and efficient action, to put a check to these disorders, and preserve our land truly free. But there are signs of the times of sober portent, and well worthy of grave consideration, and to some of these I ask attention. I shall speak of four—1. The extremely corrupt state of the public press, and the immense power it wields. 2. The prevailing spirit of intolerance. 3. The

tendency to act in masses, too often exclusive in their very character. 4. The prevalent want of truth.

1. First, then, "the signs of the times" are portentous in the extremely corrupt state of the public press, joined to the immense power it wields. There is no difference amongst us upon the subject of the liberty of the press. It is guaranteed by the constitution of government under which we live, and is regarded by all as a thing not to be touched nor questioned. But liberty in this respect, any more than in any other, is not licentiousness. From the very nature of the case, it is a kind of liberty peculiarly susceptible of abuse, and can be preserved in its integrity only by a rigid regard to the great objects for which it was secured on the part of those who conduct the press itself; and the watchful purity of those, to whose entertainment or instruction it ministers. The press was to be free that it might always present an easy channel, along which fountains of knowledge as they were successively opened, might send their refreshing streams. It was to be free, that an easy and efficient instrument might be possessed, by which the public mind might be rightly directed, the machinations of tyranny exposed, the body politic from time to time invigorated, and a healthful tone of public feeling quickened and preserved. It was to become the handmaid of letters, science, and the arts, and of religion, the true foundation and support of all that is holy and valuable to men. And when we look back at the past history of the race, it requires but a glance to perceive, that the press has nobly discharged its high office of enlightening, delighting, and blessing the world. But for it, knowledge would still be the monopoly of the few, and the sublimest oratory, the world has ever known, the most gorgeous and thrilling poetry its bards ever chanted, the most powerful arguments for religion and immortality which the human mind ever framed, or the Divine mind ever inspired, would have been lost amid the vague traditions through which it would have been attempted to transmit them. Indeed it scarce admits of a doubt, that but for the press, the world's civilization in aught of the high and extended sense in which we now contemplate it, would be a dream.

I did not intend, however, to descant on the value to the world of the great discovery of printing. But it is plain even from these few remarks, how immensely important and powerful an engine it furnished to mankind,—powerful, be it remembered, as well for evil as for good. It is sometimes

thought, that those who immediately conduct the public press, are answerable for all the harm which it may do when corrupted. It is forgotten, that, like every thing else provided for the public, its character largely depends upon the general character of that public amid and for which it is established. No man would venture to outrage the good and correct feelings and principles of a portion of the community through the press, if he did not feel sure of the support and countenance of another portion of it. And unhappily, in a country like ours, hardly any subject can arise likely at all to agitate the public mind, which a shrewd publisher, watching the current of events, may not on one side or the other turn to the account, either of his avarice or his popularity. There is here a continual temptation to make the press the exciting cause, or the supporter, of a popular ferment. A story loosely put together, or artfully gotten up for the occasion, which left to itself might soon die, acquires in the columns of a gazette a thousandfold of strength, and becomes in its columns the source of incalculable mischief. Party or personal animosity, can it only employ this channel of communication, may instil poison into the public mind, which will rankle and ferment there, and at last burst forth with volcanic fury. And if when such is the case, and every consideration demands that the storm should be at once allayed, the press continues to throw off its guarded inuendoes, its artful surmises, its coloured statements of facts as they transpire, or its cautious and qualified censures of those who have done what they may to disturb the public peace, and the settled order of society, it may easily be seen how the mischief may be perpetuated, and what accumulated strength and support may result to the aggressors.

I have had in mind thus far no one side of any of the great questions in politics, morals, or religion, which divide the country. On almost all these questions, there has been much to blame on both sides. Private character and reputation have been tampered with, and made the butt of the foulest abuse, however pure and exalted they were in reality, merely by their being associated with some obnoxious party, principles, or sect. That very freedom of speech, and discussion, which should be respected as the twin sister of the freedom of the press, has virtually been denounced and attempted to be destroyed. The freedom of the press has thus become tyranny of the press—as dreadful to a sensitive mind, as an Ostracism. Upon a variety of subjects from time to time arising, a

man must forsooth hold his peace, or consent to be the object of ribaldry and slander, to be held up to public scorn or indignation, and possibly to become the sport of an infuriated mob. And what is worse, there are those who in each case will justify and applaud it. It has been said by one of our countrymen recently returned from Europe, that with all our boasts of liberty, there was vastly more enjoyed in England and some parts of the continent than here. It were well worth while to consider then, whether it be not for the welfare of all to purify the public press; and by cherishing a more healthy tone of public feeling, restrain its excesses, and make it more nearly what it was designed to be.

2. Closely connected with that which we have now considered, another inauspicious "sign of the times" is the prevalent spirit of intolerance. I do not say that there has never been so intolerant an age as this, but that, considering the advanced age of the world, the diffusion of knowledge, the boasts of liberality which are always put forth, and the means of understanding the various subjects which are presented successively to our contemplation, there does exist, widely diffused, an intolerant spirit far more worthy of some centuries ago. There is a disposition to look upon men with regard to their opinions rather than their characters, and to treat them, and speak of them accordingly, which tells poorly for our real liberality. Take any of the exciting subjects which have within a few years agitated our country, and you will find abundant illustration of this. In politics, were we to believe a hundredth part of what has been said, and written, and published, concerning men high in office or influence in the nation, we must think them monsters unworthy to live. Take the subject of anti-slavery, and whether the principles of its advocates be right or wrong, or the language they have used, or the measures they have pursued or proposed, justifiable or the contrary, in what a torrent of prejudice and crimination, has it been attempted to whelm them all without exception; and in how many cases has this cause served to screen the enormity of those outrages, which have disgraced our commercial metropolis.—Take the case of the Catholic Church. Here for several years among various denominations of Protestant Christians, has the cry been raised, and echoed from one end of the country to the other, that Popery was on the ascendant; and all that even the maddest of the Reformers, in the zeal of darker ages had said in the bitterness of their hatred against it, has been republished to

the world as the genuine picture of its present abominations. That it is a corrupt church in its doctrinal faith, I do not doubt—but it only shares this censure with those who most violently denounce it. That it abounds in a multitude of idle and childish ceremonies, we all agree—but I cannot doubt there have been many whom they have rightly affected. That its clergy have in many instances in all ages been unworthy of their sacred functions, I do not deny—but I ask, where is the church which is immaculate in this respect? That the Catholic communion holds its place of usefulness for a large class in the community who cannot be reached by any other, few who reflect will doubt. With all this, when I consider that this communion contains a larger part of Christendom, than all other Christian Churches together, that it has produced some of the greatest and best men that have ever lived, that the arts of peace have flourished under its protection; that it preserved to us whatever of ancient literature which has come down to our days; that it has often nursed a vigorous, self-denying, and healthful piety, and furnished forth the Reformers themselves with their best strength and most proved armour for the battle of reform; that it was long the only friend of education, the only light of a barbarous world; that it elevated the cross, that merciful and blessed symbol of hope, to hosts of poor pilgrims on earth to guide them to heaven, when military power and feudal ferocity were grinding them to the dust,—when in fine I remember, that in our neighbouring city, the Catholic episcopate was long held by one whose meek, unobtrusive, devoted piety, proved him, however obnoxious the doctrines of his church, one of the truest disciples of Christ since the ascension, I cannot but feel that gross injustice has been done, and is doing to this ancient community. It has been condemned most unjustly, and beyond all measure. I do not defend the Catholic religion—far from it. But I hold in regard to that, as to all other forms of Christianity, that it has its good as well as evil, and the chief reason for adverting to it at all, is to rebuke that intolerant spirit which would even now, had it the power, vent itself in far worse than indiscriminate denunciation. Indeed, who can say, but the exaggerated statements which have been sent through the land within a few years, as to the designs of the Romish church,—the zeal which has been enlisted against it among those who have been taught to consider it the mother of abominations,—and the misrepresentations of much of its doctrine and discipline which have been current, have

been the remote cause at least of the scenes of horror and outrage, which have but just been enacted at Charlestown?—If it be so, if these scenes had their origin in mere differences of religious opinion, and prejudices and hostility excited on their account, what a horrible illustration of the intolerance of the age do they furnish!

It is high time to pause,—and as men and Christians to reflect soberly upon the state of things around us. If for holding and uttering obnoxious opinions, a man's house may be demolished, his furniture burned before his eyes, his family turned away unsheltered at night, and the churches of God desecrated and despoiled—if institutions for education may be pillaged and burned, the cemeteries of the dead violated, and a large family of defenceless females driven in destitution to desert their home amid the yells and curses of a mob,—if all this may be done in one case, and in regard to one set of opinions,—who can say in the fluctuation of sentiments among men, what portion of the community may next be visited by the same condemnation? If the guardians of the public morals, and the administrators of the public laws, and the laws themselves thus in charge, may not be trusted to regulate under God all matters connected with the public weal, without the horrible interposition of a lawless multitude urged on by passion, or the instigation of artful leaders, or a base lust of plunder and destruction, who, I ask, is safe?

3. Another "sign of the times" worthy of notice, is the tendency to act in masses, to move in parties exclusive in their whole spirit and character. I allude not now, to what of itself is a very important point in this connexion, the danger of men losing all individuality of character, of every individual being so merged in the mass, that he becomes but the copy and reflection of all around him; but rather to the fact, that, upon almost all subjects which address thmselves to human consideration, men feel they must divide off into parties, and these parties act on the principle of an exclusive regard to a particular object and view of the object, and with a disposition to denounce and excommunicate all who differ from, or will not act with them. "He that is not with us is against us"—is the universal motto, and adopted with literal exactness by men of every variety of opinion and feeling, gathered into distinct and organized masses—and few comparatively have the courage to hold their own opinions by themselves, without being forced by party clamour, or allured by friendly solicitation into the ranks of one side or the other of

the numerous questions which arise. Thus opinions are forced—a few zealous individuals are called to become distinguished leaders—hosts are gradually or suddenly mustered together at their bidding—and with all the show of open and fair debate, the mass moves like one man, and succeeds or is defeated together. Every individual wears a mark by which he is known, and is caressed or shunned according as those he meets have or have not the same.

There is one circumstance, however, which, in the good providence of God, appears likely to counteract the worst effects of this condition of things. These parties are becoming so numerous, that a new set of men cannot be found for each; and consequently those who are opposed on one subject soon find themselves acting together on another. Still, in every case, there will be much of the exclusive spirit at which I have hinted. The language held by men of various parties and associations will in effect be—"you must *think* with us—you must *act* with us,—or lose fellowship." This is capable of illustration in many of the associations which exist. In the Temperance cause, as in every other, there will be men who are ready to rush upon every extreme—who are never satisfied with a gradual, however sure, success, but are always aiming at some striking and noisy result; and all who are not of the same temperament, or the same way of thinking, are viewed and treated as lukewarm or hostile. In the anti-slavery movements of the day, it is not sufficient that a man should hold the anti-slavery principles—but he must act with the society, or be abjured. And between that and the Colonization Society the war must on either side be a war of extermination, and the idea of each pursuing its own path is heretical beyond measure. To stand aloof from one, is taken to be an alliance with the other:—to disavow both, is to take the character it is thought of timid or time-serving. Similar remarks apply to almost every association which exists. Look at the various denominations of Christians among us—the case is nearly the same. There is a suspicious eye turned upon those who do not worship, or think, in the same way—and that way must be in each instance, "our" way.

In this condition of things, it behoves him who would act as becomes a Christian, to consider warily each question which is presented to him, and to act, not upon impulse, not from a love of party, not from prejudice, but from cool, deliberate conviction. To do this at all times, when beset on the right hand and on the left, is no easy matter. But a higher

principle than conformity to human judgment should actuate him, and in the end he will have his reward. Above all let him carry into every association which he joins, or hold towards those he does not join, anything but an exclusive spirit. Let him not so array together opinions and those who hold them, as to involve both in the same sweeping denunciation.

4. The last of the "signs of the times" to which I advert, is the general absence or neglect of truth: and if anything be alarming it is this. I forbear to enlarge on the importance of truth in all the relations, offices, and dealings of life, and will only say, that it is not important merely, but essential to the permanence of anything and everything valuable in life. All confidence in the intercourse of man with man depends upon it—all our knowledge of the past, the distant and that which we have not explored, depends upon it:—the whole economy of society, the whole system of instruction,—the brightest hopes which fill and sustain the soul,—all fail with the failure of the truth of the facts or statements on which they are built. Now there is a most deplorable lack of truth in almost every department of life, public or private. Look into political life, and see how measures are falsified, characters vilified, motives misrepresented, conduct aspersed, hastily or deliberately, upon proof or against it, as the case may be. In the business of legislation, how extremely difficult it is, at least for all (and that is the mass), who have not leisure or ability to watch narrowly every incident of the long train as it happens, to form any tolerably accurate judgment upon the subjects most warmly discussed, or reported upon. In religion, the views, principles, theory, and modes of worship, of the different denominations, are so garbled and misstated in the mouths of sectarians of almost every party, that we would think truth had deserted even the altar, and become lost amid the crowd of prejudiced or bigoted devotees. In social intercourse how little reliance can be placed on the thousand rumours which every day echoes; and how carelessly are these repeated and enlarged by each mouth which tells them. In more private and retired life even, the same foul spirit of untruth is too often found; deceit mingles in all the relatives of the family circle, and discontent, and embarassment, and mortification, and corruption are the consequences.—I have before spoken of the corruption of the public press. In nothing is it more corrupt than in its little regard to truth. With a recklessness perfectly amazing, that view of almost every important subject which gains public notice is given on either side, which suits

best with the general objects to which it is devoted. Accordingly the accounts furnished of every such subject, are in two papers published in the same place, on the same day, with like advantage enjoyed by each, diametrically opposite to each other. To such an extent is this the fact, that it is extremely difficult to learn the actual state of things, the truth, upon almost any subject. Everything seems more or less misrepresented. Exaggeration swells trifles into monsters. Envy contracts cases of unquestionable liberality, were they rightly understood, into meannesses. The spirit of detraction strips virtue of its deserved admiration, and that of flattery lauds very moderate deserts into sublime goodness.

Need the danger of this "sign of the times" be pointed out? Can it be doubted that its tendency in public life, is to deprive the commonwealth of the services of the best of its citizens, who will be led to withhold themselves from office, rather than become marks for every party demagogue, and unprincipled scribbler of the day? In religion must it not lead to the perpetuation of that terrible spirit of bigotry and exclusion, which perhaps more than any single cause gives edge to the weapons of infidelity? Must it not sooner or later, if not seasonably checked, undermine the very foundation of all sound morals among us, and destroy all confidence between man and man? Look too, at its effect on individual character. How can we be Christians, if wanting in truth? How can a religion of truth be supposed to sway that bosom from which integrity of purpose and word, and deed is banished? If there be any single trait which gives harmony and beauty and perfection to the character, it is truth. Let this be absent, and every other good quality is marred—the force of every other virtue is weakened—the loveliest traits prove but the exterior of loveliness, from which the soul, the essence, the substance, is wanting. And in proportion as the want of truth pervades a community or a nation, will all that is glorious or valuable in it prove frail and evanescent.

I have aimed to lead to sure trains of thought upon "the signs of the times," which, if dwelt upon and cherished, may prove useful to ourselves, to the generation of which we are a part, to those which are to come. If it be asked what is the remedy for the evils of which I have spoken, I answer in one word—True Religion—by which I mean the Christian religion—the Gospel of Jesus Christ.—It is Infidelity—it is the prevalence of infidel principles—either avowedly, or practically, and I know not but the last is the more dangerous, which is at the bottom of all. It were morally impossible if,

the gospel in its length and breadth dwelt in every heart—if its spirit and temper animated all of every age and station who have been brought to its light—if its lofty sanctions and its inspiring and immortal hopes filled every bosom—it were morally impossible that such as I have pointed out would be "the signs of the times." Would that I could awaken all to feel this as they ought! Too many are treating the Christian religion with a most unworthy neglect—are living according to any other principles than its spiritual, self-denying ones—are concentrating all their efforts, and devoting all their time and talents to the things of this world, careless of its brevity, forgetful of judgment and eternity. Alas, what multitudes of men, who possibly flatter themselves all the while how wise they are, seem to regard religion only as a part, so to speak, of worldly policy—nay, of public police;—its institutions, as possibly necessary to the temporal order and welfare of the community;—its ministers, as hired labourers, paid to do their stated work as well as they may,—not that they have any belief in much of what they speak, but only at the best, that they are ready to do their part to keep the peace of society. Again, how many are there, who are contented to contribute to the support of public worship,—to appear once on the Sabbath in their places at church, to be prayed for and to be preached at by another,—and who retire from the sanctuary, perfectly self-complacent, that they have listened with becoming reverence, and that good as it was, it fitted others better than themselves. Still again, how many are there who, with all outward respect for religion, give it no place in their hearts—live entirely without its influences—and become the stumbling-blocks and causes of offence to many weaker brethren! There is a most pressing call on all those, on all of us, to give the Gospel that sway over our consciences, over our lives, which Christ designed it to have. Christians should so wear their Christianity, that it may shed around them wherever they move holy influences. Were all that are called such, truly such, the power which is wielded by the public press would bear always and beneficently on the best interests of man; the intolerant, illiberal temper of which I have spoken, would cease; the various parties and sects organized for one or another object, would act harmoniously each in its own place,—and truth, in all her virgin purity, would company with every heart, to purify and bless. Every one should feel that he has a personal charge in this great work—and look devoutly to God for grace to help him fulfil it. No thought of

its difficulty—no doubt of its practicableness—should be suffered. Onward to the mark! should be the watchword. Time, talents, opportunity, life, should all be devoted as God would have them! Death, whenever it comes, should find each at his post! and then heaven's gates will open to receive each one to rest! F. A. FARLEY.

The following was handed to us in the form of a letter addressed to a Clergyman, which form we have not thought it worth while to alter. We publish it as containing a very satisfactory reply to the arguments said to have been urged in favour of the Trinity, by the preacher who is addressed.

LETTER ADDRESSED TO REV. L. W.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,

I HEARD your sermon on the doctrine of the Trinity. As you delivered it in a number of places, it became considerably noticed, and seems to have been accepted as one of your best performances. I am disposed, Sir, to give you credit for the ingenuity displayed in that discourse, and for a happy talent as a speaker from the pulpit. And I was particularly pleased with your *devotional exercises;* which were, apparently, and I doubt not, *sincerely*, what such public exercises always *should be*, but what, unhappily, they are not always; *humble, simple, fervent.* I was not, however, altogether pleased with the sermon; and although I disclaim and abhor the character of a *captious, uncandid, and fault-finding* hearer, yet, I think, without justly incurring the imputation of it, I may take the liberty of making some animadversions upon the sermon.

Your text was the baptismal commission, containing the formulary; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

The introduction was brief, consisting of a few remarks directed against the pride of human reasoning. You then stated your theme; the *Divine Trinity;* and announced four heads of discourse: 1. Definition: 2. Consideration of objections: 3. Confirmation: and 4. The practical importance of the doctrine.

You appeared to decline attempting to support the doctrine, in the form it is sometimes caused to assume, whether by its adversaries or friends, but only according to *your own definition;* and you remarked that "many a handsome face has been made to cast a homely profile." Your definition was nearly, or precisely, the following: "*That in the God-*

head there are three persons; the term person, however, being used in some uncommon sense; three distinctions; three somethings, call them what you will; which are the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost."

In this definition, Sir, the doctrine, as everyone may perceive, is placed on a very indeterminate foundation. And it is suspected that the design of it was to envelope the subject in a kind of obscurity and mysticism; and thus to place its defenders on a stand, where they may be invisible, intangible, and inaccessible. But, Sir, when you, and others, who have adopted that definition, come to the discussion of the *doctrine itself*, and the uses of it, both you, and they, obviously employ the word *person* in its *usual import;* intending by it, some *distinct, entire, rational agent.* You speak of the *person of the Son* as distinct from that of the Father, previously to the event of the incarnation; and you speak of the *personality* of the Holy Ghost, and maintain that He is as distinct a person from the Divine Father and Son, as they are from each other. But when the inquiry is put—*Can the one only true God be more than one rational agent? Can there be more than one truly and properly Divine Understanding, Will, and Consciousness?* You then retreat into the place of refuge, previously prepared, and there shroud yourself in misty dimness and impenetrable clouds.

You occupied time, Sir, as you will recollect, to prove the *personality* of the Holy Ghost. You affirmed that he must be a *person*, and not an attribute, or an operation, or an office, because the Father is a *person*, and the Son is a *person*, and it would be grossly incongruous to connect two *persons* and an *attribute* together, in the manner, they are connected, in the *formulary of Baptism*, and in the *Benediction*, and in the *testimony of the three Heavenly Witnesses*, [a spurious passage]. The Father being a person, the Son, of course, must be a person, and the Holy Spirit a person, for each is distinct from, and equal to the other. Now, Sir, in asserting these things, do you not use the word *person*, in its *common signification?* As much so, at least, as the term *God* (whose mode of existence none can comprehend), is commonly understood to signify a *person;* i. e. *a Being possessed of an understanding, a will, and a power of voluntary effort.* If the term person, in the doctrine of the Trinity, mean nothing more than some uncertain and incomprehensible *distinction*, whence can it be known that this *distinction* amounts to what you make of it? or that it will answer your purpose in the divisional work of redemption? or that it is any thing more than what a con-

sistent Unitarian may admit it to be? So long as you cannot define, or understand, what the distinction is, how can you know that the second distinction is equal to the first; or that the third is, in personality, equal to the two former? Can we safely reason from terms which we do not understand?

And here, Sir, I will premise that it is not my object to decry the doctrine of *a Divine Trinity. I admit the doctrine.* Whoever believes the New Testament must admit the existence of *the Father, the Son,* and *the Holy Ghost. These three Divine Names constitute the Scriptural Trinity.* And I further admit that this doctrine is *incomprehensible.* "No man knoweth who the Son is but the Father, neither knoweth any man who the Father is but the Son." The Son is called *God,* and therefore He *is God;* but in what sense *He is God,* has, probably never been comprehended by the human intellect. Of one thing, however, I think, we may feel a full confidence, viz. that he is *not God* in any sense inconsistent with the fact—*that the Father is the only true God.*

In regard to the *personification* of the Holy Spirit, there can be no doubt; but the truth of his *personality* manifestly is disputable. I will not say that the doctrine of it *is untrue;* nor can I say that I do believe it to be true. Your argument in confirmation of the doctrine, derived from the connection of the names, is, in my view, inconclusive. I would refer you to the three earthly witnesses, "There are three that bear witness on the earth, the Spirit, and the Water, and the Blood." If the Spirit be a *person,* as you teach us, and if your principle of inference be correct, then the Water and the Blood must be *persons* also.

As a further test of this principle of inference, adopted by you, Sir, we will change the application of it, and ascertain what it will then effect. The *water* and the *blood* are *not* persons, therefore, the *Spirit* is *not* a person; because thus to connect *persons* and *things* together, is improper and inadmissible. The case stands thus—The three Heavenly Witnesses are, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost. The first and second of these witnesses are *persons,* therefore, you infer that the *third is a person also.* The three which bear witness on the earth are the Spirit, the water, and the blood. Two of these, the water and the blood, are *not* persons; the inference, therefore, is, that the other, the Spirit, is *not* a person. The very same witness is, by this rule, proved *to be* a person, in the one case, and *not to be* a person in the other. The rule will prove two opposite things. And in doing so its

true character cannot be mistaken. It is an illegitimate rule.

You will also recollect, Sir, that you ridiculed the stupidity of those who could not see the force of your reasoning, in this instance, by comparing it to what that of Lot, in Sodom, would have been, had he told his sons-in-law, that he had seen *three* men; and when asked to explain himself, had replied, that he reckoned the *shining wings* of the *two* angels to constitute *a third person*. What a happiness it is, Sir, to have on every needful occasion, just and apt thoughts, both for argument and illustration.

Having defined the doctrine, you proceeded to consider the objections. I do not remember that you took notice of more than one; *its being incomprehensible, and apparently self-inconsistent*. This you admitted, but contended that it was not *impossible*. I doubt, Sir, the perfect justice of this representation. The opposers of the doctrine have strongly urged the *absence of scriptural proof*, and the irreconcilable character of it, to the unity of God; so much and so frequently insisted upon in the Bible. You gave a variety of illustrations that a doctrine might be *incomprehensible*, but not *absurd*. The propriety of this cannot reasonably be questioned; but they did not, to my mind, remove the objections to the doctrine of the Trinity, *as it is commonly expressed and understood*. That a being, or a thing, should be *three* in some respects, and *one*, in another respect, is no inconsistency. But that a being or a thing should be *properly one*, so as to *exclude plurality*, and yet, at the same time, truly and properly *three*, so as to imply plurality, is a contradiction. An army cannot have *one*, and only one supreme commander, and yet have *three persons* who are each and severally invested with supreme authority. If they are not persons, in the proper sense of the word, they, of course, are not properly and severally, *commanders;* and if each of the three Divine Distinctions be not *persons properly so called*, then each of them, cannot, in the proper acceptation of the word, *be God*. For how can each of them, severally and properly *be God*, when each of them is not properly a *person?* For is it not as evident that there is a Divine *person*, as it is, that there is a God?

The old and genuine doctrine of the Trinity is that of three distinct persons, in *the proper import of the words*. So the doctrine stood for more than a thousand years. The idea of an uncommon and an unknown sense of the term *person*, is a modern invention. And it is an *innovation*. It is not *orthodoxy*. And we need not travel far back, in the track of time,

in order to arrive at the period when the publication of such a sentiment would have been as perilous to its author, as it was for the adventurous Luther to denounce the Holy Roman Catholic Church. And this new invention, Sir, I believe, is of no worth to the cause. As a fact, it cannot be proved. And as an expedient, it can have little efficiency. While it may, for a moment, seem to afford some partial relief at *one point*, it causes an intolerable pressure *at another*. The old Trinitarians held that the Divine Nature of the Son, being truly and properly *God*, was truly and properly a *person*. You hold that He is the *true God*, and yet, as far as Divine, not a *true person*, in the known acceptation of the term. And here, Sir, do you not perceive that an unsupportable oppression lies upon the neck of your theory?

The Westminster Divines were unadulterated Trinitarians. They were explicit and said, "There are three persons in the Godhead, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." And here is no self-inconsistency. For the term, *Godhead*, does not necessarily express *one individual person*. As there may be one, two, or more, persons constituting a *committee* or a *directory*, so a *Godhead* may be conceived of, as consisting of *one* person, or of *a plurality*. And, Sir, when you, and others, speak of three distinct and equal persons, in one God, you, and they, obviously and necessarily use the term *God*, in the sense of *Godhead*. But when, in the same breath, you declare of each of the three persons, that they, individually, severally, and properly, *are God*, you use the word *God*, in a different and *individual* sense. We will take an example from the Athanasian Creed. *The Father, who is not the Son, is God; the Son, who is not the Father, is God; and the Holy Ghost, who is different from the Father and the Son, is God; and yet, there is but one God.* It is manifest that the term God is here used in different senses, and, in the last instance, in the sense of *Godhead;* for otherwise the language would be as contradictory, as it would be to say; "Our earth has one moon named A, and another different moon named B, and another, named C, and yet our earth has but one moon."

The fact being undeniable, that you, and other Trinitarians, often use the term God as equivalent to *Godhead* (I do not, however, mean the scriptural, but the catechetical sense of *Godhead*), the inquiry properly comes up, *Is it consistent with the language and instructions of the Bible to affix that meaning to the term, God?* The Holy Scriptures not only

teach the doctrine of one God, and mention no other than one, but they also frequently and expressly declare on the contrary, that there is *not* more than ONE. "The Lord our God is one Lord." I am God and there is no other." "Thou shalt have no other God than me.". "Beside me there is no God, I know not any." "There is no other God but one." "To us there is one God, the Father." "There is one God and one Mediator between God and man, the Man Christ Jesus." It hence appears that either the unity of God must be a proper and perfect unity, or that the Scriptures are calculated to deceive us. And shall we impute such an attribute to the Holy Book of God?

Having arrived at your third head, the *Confirmation*, you announced that the doctrine of the Trinity was purely a matter of *Divine Revelation*, and could be learned and supported from no other source; and then you proceeded to adduce the proof-texts.—These you divided into two classes, the *direct*; and the *indirect*. I entirely concede, Sir, the correctness of your remarks, that the doctrine of the Trinity, if true, must be learned from the Holy Scriptures. To the Law and to the Testimony, let every Christian make his appeal. If the doctrine of the Trinity be found there, plainly asserted, let it not, even for the price of life, be denied. We would remember the tremendous malediction—*If any man add unto, or take away from, the things of this Book, God shall inflict upon him the plagues denounced in it; and take away his part, his name, from the Book of Life.* "See that thou diminish not aught from them." We can have no rational motive for perverting the truth, for deceiving ourselves, or misleading others.

Your first proof-text, was Matthew xxviii. 19; *the commission for Baptism.* The second, was 1 Cor. xiii. 14; *the Benediction.* The third was 1 John v. 7; *the Three Heavenly Witnesses.* The fourth was Rev. i. 4, 5, *the Benedictory Salutation of the Apostle to the Churches.* You represented that the three names, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, stand on equal grounds, and consequently, by implication, place those signified by them on the ground of *equality*; so that if any of them be the TRUE GOD, the others, must, likewise, sustain the same character. I have already, Sir, expressed my hesitation to admit this principle of making inferences. It is not correct; it is illegitimate. I could prove the truth of my remark by producing, probably, more than a hundred examples. But I am unwil-

ling to spend the time. The proper method of determining Who, and What, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, are, is to apply *the rule of analogy (Prfoessor S.'s usus loquendi)*, i. e. inquire what these terms evidently signify in other parts of the Bible.

Who, then, is the Father? In answer, read John, the Gospel, xvii. 3. "And this is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." The Father is here called *the only true God!* And it is the Son, who gives this style and character to the Father. The language seems to be so simple and explicit, as to be capable of but one meaning. It plainly declares *one God*, and *only one;* and that the *Divine Father is this one God.* And this language, and this sentiment, comport, perfectly and obviously with the current language and sentiment, of all parts of the Bible. And, Sir, does this style and character of the Divine Father imply no more than He is *one of three co-equal persons in the Godhead?* And is it equally true, of the Son, that He is the *only true God;* and also of the Holy Spirit? What force, then, is there in language? and what dependence can be put upon it? The explicit and solemn declaration of the Lord Jesus Christ is, that the *Father is the only true God;* and yet according to the doctrine of the Trinity, *as it is usually understood*, there are two other persons that are severally *the only true God.* Who is it, Sir, that takes liberty in construing the language of the Sacred Word? Are the *ultra-Universalists* the only persons who do this? Surely they are not alone.

It cannot be justly said that the text, in John xvii. 3, is but a *solitary* one, and must therefore, bend, in its interpretations, to the general sentiment of the Scriptures. There is another, 1 Cor. viii. 6, of a very kindred description. "But to us there is one God, the Father, of whom are all things." The apostle in this passage, utters a truth which he seems to have thought no Christian, nor Jew, was inclined to doubt, for he states it, not as a *dogma*, or as a *conclusion*, but as a *premise*, as a point of doctrine so fully established, that he might reason from it. And, Sir, I could now proceed and adduce text after text, confirming the sentiment that the *Father is the only true God.* But I must desist. There is no necessity. The truth of it appears, as it were, on every page, in the Bible.

We have, I trust, found who the Father is; and now proceed to inquire *Who is the Son? He is Jesus Christ whom*

God hath sent into the world, to seek and save that which is lost. He is the Mediator between God and man. He is the Son of God; the only begotten and dearly beloved Son of the Divine Father: He is the Son of God in a sense, in which no other person is. He is the Redeemer; the only Saviour of men. He is the resurrection and the life. By Him God made the worlds; and by Him, he hath appointed a day, in which He will judge the world. It deserves to be noted, that, in the two sacred texts, above considered, the Son is not only distinguished from the *Father*, but is distinguished from *the only true God.* The Father is *never* distinguished from the only true God. The Son is *always* thus distinguished. The prerogative of the Father is different from that of the Son. The Father hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world, by that man whom he hath ordained. The Father sent the Son, and commissioned him, by commandment, for what he should do, and what he should speak. The Father dwells in the Son; and in the Son dwells the fulness of the Godhead. The Son of himself can do nothing; it is the Father in him, that doeth the work. The Son arose from the dead, and is invested with all power in heaven and earth; and it was the Father who raised him from the dead, and exalted him with his own right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour. The Son had power to lay down his life, and to take it again, and this commandment, he had received from the Father.

We are aware that he said, *I and my Father are one;* and that he also represented that he and his disciples were one. But he did not say that he and his Father are *equals;* nor will any believe that he and his disciples are equal, the one to the other. The *oneness* of which he spake was, manifestly, a *moral union*, and not a *physical unity.* The apostle declares of the Son, that though he was in the form of God, and did not think it robbery to be as God, or equal to God, yet he condescended to forego that honour. The meaning cannot be that he was the same Being, *as the one eternal God;* for that construction would divest the passage of all consistent meaning; nor can it signify, that the Son was equal to the Father *in all essential respects*, for then it could have been no object with him to aspire to the honour of being *as God*, or *equal to God*, because, on the supposition, such he was and ever must have been. Perhaps the meaning is, *that previously to his incarnation the Divine Son was, as the Representative of his Divine Father, invested with a*

certain formal glory, and worshipped in heaven; and that He voluntarily resigned it in order to come into this world in the great errand of salvation for mankind. But what the precise import of the passage is, I do not pretend to know; neither do you know, Sir; and perhaps no man will know, on earth, unless it be by the help of *inspiration.* Let this, however, be as it may, one ground may be safely taken (and we have already taken it), that the Son never was equal to God, in *such a sense* as is inconsistent with the fact, *that His Father alone is the only true God.*

Much more, Sir, might be said, and, perhaps, it may seem, ought to be said, under this head of discourse; but the limits I propose to myself do not permit me to proceed; and if what I have already remarked, upon a few of the passages which you produced, be just, and invalidate your construction of them, a further examination, and in detal, becomes unnecessary.

Q. P. O.

[Remainder in the next number.]

Scripture Truth sufficiently Obvious.

STRANGE as it may seem, it is in religion more than in any thing else, that mankind are prone to lose sight of what is most obvious and important, and to labour after what is more remote and subtile, and more doubtful both in respect to its truth and utility. Thus it was that the Israelites were not satisfied with the plain instructions of Moses, but were ready to ask who shall go up to heaven, or beyond the sea, to bring them true and infallible instructions. And St. Paul, in the same spirit, indicates, that there were those among his brethren, who would bring Christ down again from heaven, or, as if setting aside his resurrection, call him from the depths below, to impart God's word anew. And what sort of character does he ascribe to these persons? They have a Godly zeal, he says, but not according to knowledge; and not considering the righteousness of God, that righteousness which God requires, they seek to establish a righteousness of their own. And what direction does the Apostle give? "If thou confess with thy mouth that Jesus is the *Lord*, and be-

lieve in thy heart (heartily and sincerely believe) that God raised him from the dead, thou wilt be saved." This is the simple creed prescribed by Paul; the same apostle whose epistles contain some things, as Peter, his fellow-apostle says, which are hard to be understood. And it is these obscure passages, of doubtful or local interpretation, that have given occasion to those, who are not content with the plain instructions of Christ and his apostles, to erect a system of mysterious and metaphysical theology, that has at times distracted the whole Christian world, and well nigh effaced the benign character of the gospel of peace. No sooner did the ministry of Christ commence, than some,—not looking or caring for the inspiration and sovereignty of divine truth, for a kingdom that began and which was to be established without observation, without external show,—openly manifested their disappointment; while others designedly misinterpreted what was plain, and put a forced meaning upon the Saviour's declarations, which could originate only from perverseness. And St. Paul, besides noticing the faults and corruptions of his own countrymen, warns his converts against *philosophizing* Christians; and reproves their divisions into sects; and their ranging themselves under the banners of distinguished leaders. If there were just occasion for the Apostle's reproofs of this kind, we are not to expect that future converts would turn all at once to the simplicity that is in Christ. As the Jews were slow to reject even their burdensome ritual, and to throw off the load of traditionary absurdities, so the learned Gentile converts could not lay aside altogether the dreams of their mythology, and their philosophical refinements. The natural causes which were at work, even under the teaching of Christ and his Apostles, who were clothed with miraculous powers, continued to operate afterwards; and while the heathen converts mingled their prejudices and tenets with the new religion,—they, no less than the Jews, were ashamed to be the disciples of a crucified Saviour. "Christ crucified was to the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Greeks foolishness." And they were ready to adopt any mystical doctrine that would free them from the reproach of allegiance to a crucified Lord. The early history of the church, affords ample illustrations of the truth of the above remarks—of the want of satisfaction which was felt in the plain instructions of our Saviour, and of the disposition to pry into the heavens above, and the depths below, for what it had not pleased the God of truth to reveal. Hence the early

fathers of the Christian church were lost in endless mazes, while searching into the mysteries of the Divine essence, and endeavouring to become wise beyond what is written, by uniting philosophy with revelation. And four centuries after Christ, during which time, it might be supposed that what was revealed in God's word might have been ascertained with as much certainty as God in his wisdom intended it should be, St. Augustine, in his Confessions, affirmed that he had no conception of the incarnation in the person of Christ, till he read the books of Plato; and that he was afterwards confirmed in his opinion by reading the Scriptures. A strange confession, and one which in these days would go pretty far to destroy one's authority in matters of faith; yet St. Augustine was as great an oracle with popes and councils, as Calvin has ever been with Protestant churches and synods. I need not travel into the dark ages, or come down to times succeeding the reformation, to illustrate my subject; for I believe it will be granted, that in regard to religious truth, mankind are exceedingly prone to lose sight of the greater good, and to go in quest of what is remote; of what, if not unattainable, is of no practical worth.

If this be so, it is highly important to inquire, how we are to guard against this prevailing tendency? It is to be guarded against, I believe, only by the independent use of our own understanding. To some persons, this may at first appear to be a startling proposition. Much pains has been taken to prostrate the understanding—that celestial gift—that gift of God's own inspiration—before the altar of a blind, implicit faith. No efforts have been spared by ambitious men to limit the exercise of reason upon speculative dogmas, and to substitute authority in its place. For with all our boasting of the doctrines of the Reformation, this tyranny over the mind is a fragment of papacy—still tenaciously preserved. And no wonder that solemn warnings against inquiry into doctrines long handed down, with all the array of terrific consequences annexed to the opposite views, should have their influence on weak and timid minds. It is only by escaping from this thraldom, that we can acquire that liberty wherewith Christ has made us free. This liberty does not allow us to surrender our judgment to the church papal, or the church reformed, but only to the word of God and the kingdom that he hath established. Is human authority of no value then? It is certainly of no value, till it is shown in some way that it is entitled to respect. We all have but one opinion of pa-

pal authority, which has had for ages, and still has the most wide-spread dominion in regard to Christian doctrines and usages. And can we believe that the authority of the major part of the Protestant church, merely because it is the major part, possesses an infallibility which we deny to that of the Papal? I would speak with due reverence of the reformers and of the Reformation. Whatever errors they failed to correct, and whatever errors they introduced, they secured to us that glorious inheritance, that birthright of every Christian, the right of private judgment. And this it is our solemn duty to cherish. I know not why the same sort of reasoning should not apply to all Protestant churches, and councils, and synods, and assemblies, whose purpose it is to establish certain dogmas and usages, which we admit to be valid in regard to the Papal. To say nothing of their right to interference in these matters, there are other questions of no small importance. Were the persons concerned so circumstanced as to be peculiarly secure against error? Did they meet to deliberate calmly in order to settle some great and manifest truths of Christianity, or, on the contrary, to combat some supposed heresy? Were they remarkable for Christian humility, or distinguished for arrogance and presumption? Were their enactments made in a peaceful state of the church, or when it was rent by factions? If these questions are not settled in their favour, their decrees are entitled to no respect; and if they are settled in their favour, they are entitled to no more respect than the evidence upon which those decrees are founded. These questions being fairly disposed of, the thinking, independent mind will be little affected by such extraneous authority.

Another and probably the greatest enemy to the independent exercise of the understanding in coming to the knowledge of obvious truth, is fear. I am far from thinking that fear is to be banished, as a motive of action and conduct. The fear of *doing wrong*, fear proceeding from a guilty conscience, and the consequent fear of God's displeasure, no good man would wish to destroy. But fear, as it affects one's opinions, may be the most powerful adversary of truth. What I mean by fear, therefore, is something very different from caution, or a sense of responsibility—it is the opposite of presumption; and as presumption arises from undue confidence and boldness, so fear proceeds from undue self-distrust and timidity. Now is it possible that such fear can be favourable to the understanding and judgment in forming and maintaining our opinions? May

it not, on the contrary, betray us? May it not lead us to give a reluctant assent to tenets and notions, which, if they do not corrupt our purity, may essentially affect our tranquillity and happiness. But are not,—I make the appeal with reluctance,—are not the fears of mankind too often addressed, in the popular expositions and discourses of some of the interpreters of God's word, in order to secure their profession and belief of certain opinions? Are not these fears roused by exaggerated descriptions of human nature (that nature which the God of all purity has seen fit to give us), and by vague descriptions of the conversion of this nature, which have their origin too much in the imagination and passions? I might add also many subtle points, concerning the nature of Christ, and the mode in which we are saved by his merits. Now if it be true, as I believe it is, that such appeals to the fears of mankind are quite as frequent and earnest on the part of some of the expounders of God's word, as to their fears from guilt which is voluntarily contracted, let me ask if this course is founded in the word of God? It is one thing to explain what we think is found in the Scriptures, and quite another to array a different belief with a host of terrors and frightful images. And if Christ is any model for preaching, it seems to me that they who pursue the course I have described, have strangely mistaken their duty.

The only instance I find, in Christ's preaching, where there is any colour for supposing a denunciation of punishment for want of belief in his doctrine, is that in which one of the evangelists gives an account of the commission which Jesus gave to the eleven apostles, after his resurrection, "Go into all the world and preach the gospel. He who believeth it and is baptized will be saved; but he who believeth not will be damned or [condemned]." What belief is meant? Belief in the gospel as a divine dispensation. And what is the condemnation for unbelief? I do not know. But it seems to me to be intended, that if those to whom this gospel is offered, continue obdurate, and cherish their sins, they are exposed to greater punishment, than those are to whom these good tidings are not announced. But punishment of sins, which have a well-known name and character, such as cruelty, hypocrisy, blasphemy, evil speaking, and disgraceful crimes, are threatened in the strongest terms. Now how different is this from that preaching of the word which would make our salvation depend upon certain formulas of doctrine, deduced from single insulated passages of Scripture which have been

disputed about from the beginning of the christian dispensation to this time, and can never be settled without a new light from heaven.

Infidelity.

The following extract from a Sermon of the Rev. Robert Aspland, London, has been sent to us by a respected correspondent who remarks:—"If you should take the same view of the paragraph as I do, it cannot fail to strengthen your hands in the good work in which you are engaged. I think, also, that it will be very acceptable to your readers."

"Some persons are alarmed, more affect to be alarmed, at the progress of what is called infidelity. For one, I am free to avow, that though I hold no conviction of my understanding more certain than the truth, and no sentiment of my heart dearer than the excellence of Christianity, I am, notwithstanding, quite satisfied with the state of the public mind. A great process has been carrying on, and we are now nearly arrived at the crisis. Those of us who are no longer young may hope to see the result. Judging from the signs of the times, I cannot doubt that the issue will be in favour of the rational gospel. Unbelievers have done unspeakable good in exposing and making men ashamed of the corruptions of Christianity. Without meaning or knowing it, they have been instruments in the hands of Providence for purifying and saving true religion. Such of them as are of pure mind and benevolent feelings (and that there are such amongst them it were gross bigotry to deny), have served the interests of real piety, although they may have carried their offerings to the Unknown God. They have opposed the Christian faith merely because they gave ear to the popular voice, and took for Christian, doctrines which are derogatory to the Divine character, revolting to the human understanding, and at war with the peace of the world, and the improvement of social institutions. Let them learn what the gospel is, a scheme for glorifying the Parent Creator by making the creature man happy, and great in his virtuous happiness, and they will be prompt to embrace it, and the first to lay themselves out for its promotion. They may not enrol themselves of

any one church or sect; they may subscribe and assent to no given creed; they may be unable to define their faith or sentiments in words; but as far as they love goodness and aspire to intellectual and moral greatness, they are the disciples of Christ. This discipleship they will sooner or later be eager to avow; for everything in nature, everything in Providence, everything in the human mind and everything in the human heart, as it comes from the hand of its Maker, tends towards what is just in principle and benevolent in feeling; that is, tends towards Jesus Christ, in whom are fulfilled the highest thoughts of the wise and the best wishes of the good."

The Christian Denomination.

I HAVE been looking for sometime past with great interest to the sect called *Christians*, and I doubt not that every Unitarian, who earnestly wishes the success of the unadulterated gospel, will sympathize with me in this regard. They acknowledge no creeds. They recognise the Scriptures, and the Scriptures only, as the standard of faith and duty. They exclude from their fellowship no one who sincerely professes to be a disciple of Jesus, whatever may be his opinion on debateable points. They are universally agreed likewise in the great, fundamental doctrines of Christianity, that the Father alone is God and that Jesus Christ is his Son. For these truths they are contending earnestly and with increasing success. Their number is augmenting to such an extent, that in some quarters it is an object of alarm. We are told by the "Palladium," that there are two hundred ministers of their connection in the State of New York, "and near one thousand in America. Their churches are comparatively few in New-England, though some of them (the one for instance, at New Bedford*) are large and flourishing. Their greatest strength is in the interior of New York and at the West. On a large mass of society their preachers already exert a strong influence in the sphere in which they act; they are doing for the cause of truth what no other men under the existing cir-

* This society has recently erected with great ease a large and handsome church at an expense of twenty-two thousand dollars. The number of communicants recently added, under very favourable circumstances, is nearly one hundred.

cumstances could accomplish. Acquainted, as they are, with the manners, characters, and wants of those among whom they move, they are better fitted to advance the cause of liberal Christianity in the West, than preachers educated at a divinity college, who must necessarily be supposed to want that kind of knowledge and tact, which can be gained only by long experience, and to be more sensitive to obstacles of a peculiar kind, which the former either disregard or do not feel. In Unitarian societies already organized at the West, or among certain classes, preachers from New England can work with effect. But in the great and noble work which as pioneers they have undertaken with so much zeal and resolution, the Christians are better. They open the way and sow the seed broadcast. And it is to be believed, that the fruit of what they thus sow in their own circle of labour may be wafted by some auspicious breeze to circles beyond. Besides the influence which their preachers exert in their ordinary ministrations and their public controversies, something is to be attributed to their periodicals, which are extensively circulated, and to other tracts. Already it is to be supposed, they have done much towards enlightening the public mind within the sphere of their influence; and by aiming at the right points of inquiry. Such being the case; we, who are professedly anxious for the progress of the truth, cannot but feel that they have strong claims on our sympathy and assistance; and in whatever direction a call may be made by our brethren, I hope it will be met with a generous alacrity. In its character and tendencies their denomination must be regarded as one of the first importance to the cause of truth.

I am glad to perceive that they are beginning to look to a more educated ministry.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Prayers for Children and young Persons. Compiled by a Teacher, for the use of Sabbath Schools, and Families. Second Edition. JOHN W. FOSTER. Portsmouth. 1834. pp. 43. 12mo.

THIS is a beautiful little work, and well adapted to those for whom it was prepared. It comes from the right quarter, from

the practical teacher of Christianity to the young. He is evidently intimate with the wants of the juvenile heart, and understands how to lead it in its communion with its Heavenly Father. The prayers are accordingly simple, earnest, confiding; such indeed as all prayers ought to be, whether breathed from the lips of the old or young. They are encumbered with no mysterious, unintelligible terms or sentences, as stumbling-blocks in the child's walk with God. Both the language and sentiments are entirely appropriate. We mention these things the rather, because it has been, and is now, too often the case, that the young mind is mystified, and the young heart damped in its early religious feelings by the dark and forbidding aspect which Prayer is made to assume; the child fears to engage in it, and shrinks away from the most delightful and elevated of exercises as from the entrance to a tomb. This most unhappy and injurious result the present compilation is well calculated to avert. "Our Father who art in Heaven," is not used as an unmeaning phrase. Those who use this book aright and imbibe its spirit, will feel when they pray, that God is truly their Father, and that to commune with him is one of the most blessed privileges as well as solemn duties that the young can enjoy.

These prayers were designed in part for Sunday schools, and we hope most sincerely that they will be extensively used in those institutions. Sunday-school instruction will avail but little, if the pupils are not taught how to pray, and induced to form fixed devotional habits. The soil of the mind may be rich, and the seed of the teacher be well sown, but no "increase" can be looked for unless the daily fertilizing influences of sun and rain and dew, the divine influences of prayer, descend upon the soul aud soften and warm it.

We subjoin a prayer for Sunday morning.

"Most holy and eternal God, the Lord and Sovereign of all! I humbly present to thee, on this sacred morning, my soul and body, to be disposed of by thee for thy glory, to be blessed by thy providence, to be guided by thy counsel, and to be sanctified by thy spirit.

"This day, O Lord, and all the days of my life, I dedicate to thee. Take from me all slothfulness, and give me a diligent and an active spirit. Teach me to watch over all my ways, that I may not be overcome by sudden temptations. Be thou my guide in all my actions; my protector in all dangers. Give me a healthful body, and a clear understanding. Make me just and charitable; religious and humble; cheerful and contented. Pardon all my sins; and fix my thoughts, my hopes, and desires upon heaven. Make me to love thee, my God, and Jesus Christ, thy Son, whom thou hast sent for my redemption. Teach me to obey all thy commands; and at last, make me a partaker in all thy promises.

"Assist me in the duties of this day. In thy house may I be devout and humble. In my retirement, may I examine myself, and repent of my sins. May I learn more of thee, and be better prepared to serve thee here, and to meet thee at last in heaven. Grant this, O God, through Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour. Amen." L.

CORRESPONDENCE AND INTELLIGENCE.

FOURTH LETTER TO THE REV. ADIN BALLOU.

Harvard, Sept. 1st, 1834.

DEAR SIR,

IN my last letter I gave you what I thought was the meaning of the three passages of Scripture, which you quote as involving the doctrine of universal restoration. Neither these passages, nor the many other passages, which are frequently adduced as proofs of your doctrine, have seemed to me to teach the doctrine. And while I find no plain declaration that all will be finally restored to holiness and happiness, I find many passages which seem to teach the opposite doctrine. If a final restoration be the true doctrine, so important to be known, for the vindication of the character of God, and for the moral welfare of mankind, it has seemed strange to me, that the Bible should so darkly and obscurely teach it, and with such apparent plainness teach a contrary doctrine. Believing this to be the fact, I have doubted the propriety of drawing an inference from the fundamental truths of revelation, which appears to contradict the instructions of that revelation. We cannot tell exactly what God must do, and what he must not do in order to sustain the character of a holy, wise, and benevolent being. We can say he will do no wrong, and that he will certainly do right; but many things may be perfectly consistent with the divine rectitude, which to us may seem contrary to it. We have so many evidences of his power, wisdom, and goodness, that we firmly believe that he is powerful, wise, and good, though there are many things, in which his wisdom and goodness are not apparent to us. Knowing that God was infinite in power, wisdom and goodness, should we beforehand have supposed that he would create such a world as this? a world that has always been so full of ignorance, error, sin, and suffering? Why should a benevolent being, so wise and mighty, form such a creature as man? Why should he give him such a nature? Why should he subject him to such a course of discipline? Why should he cause him to pass through such scenes of temptation, trial, and affliction? Why did not Infinite Benevolence secure to man the same amount of good without the evil? Why might we not have been rendered holy and happy without all this tribulation and sorrow which now fall to our lot? How could a being of such love, tenderness, and compassion give existence to creatures capable of and exposed to so much evil and suffering? Say that all will be finally happy, yet why were such means of happiness appointed in preference to any other? A thousand such questions might be asked, and the wisest answer we can give them is, *we know not.* He has created such a world and such beings, and subjected them to such a course of discipline. We cannot perceive the reasons of all his dealings, nor fathom all his designs. We are but very partially acquainted with that scene of things in which we are placed. A final restoration does not free the doctrine of the divine benevolence from all its difficulties; nor do the views of the ultra-Universalists. For if God is love, why does he permit his offspring to endure any suffering at all, even in this world? Could he not have prevented it? I do not doubt the goodness of God, though there are many things which I cannot explain nor understand.

The manner in which you speak of a future retribution and a restoration, is calculated to leave the impression, that God does not furnish us with sufficient means of holiness in this world, or that he will punish us for

that which we could not avoid. I have supposed that he makes just such conditions of happiness as we can comply with, if we choose—that he requires nothing of us which we are unable to perform. If he does thus, how does it impeach his benevolence, if we abuse his mercy, and render ourselves miserable? Behold that impenitent sinner, loaded with guilt, and just dropping into the grave. Why is he going out of the world, polluted, hardened, and wretched? Has he had no space for repentance? O yes. Year after year has he been continued in this state of probation. But then has he enjoyed any advantages for growing wiser and better? Yes, he has been made acquainted with his condition and duty; he has been favoured with the means of knowledge, wisdom, holiness, and virtue; but he has neglected and abused them. He might have repented long ago. He was told of his danger, and exhorted to flee to the ark of safety; but he remained indifferent and rebellious. Is God malevolent; is God cruel; because he does not wait millions of years for him to do what he might have done in a very little time? It has seemed to me that you do not sufficiently consider the aggravated sinfulness of the sinner: what light and advantages he has abused: what offers of grace he has rejected: what overtures of mercy he has slighted: what intreaties and invitations he has disregarded: what admonitions and warnings he has treated with contempt: what provisions for his return to his Heavenly Father he has neglected. Notwithstanding all that has been done for his pardon and salvation, he continues a stranger and a rebel. He has neither feared the displeasure and judgments of God, nor sought his approbation and love. We ought to bear such things in mind. God's love is not a blind passion, but a holy and reasonable love. His goodness is the goodness of a perfectly moral being. He has placed holiness and happiness within our reach, and if we are miserable, it is our own fault.

The Scriptures seem to me to inculcate the doctrine, that our time of probation is limited to this life. If I could discover your doctrine of a restoration plainly taught in divine revelation, I think I should cordially embrace it. But until I can, I must reject it. Arguing from what we see and know, what probability is there that all those who die impenitent will become holy in a future state? If such a person has continued disobedient and sinful through life, how does it encourage the hope that he will repent and become holy after death? He has abused his mercies here; why may he not hereafter? He has neglected his means of grace in this world; how are we sure that he will not in the world to come? Perhaps you will say that his moral and religious advantages will be increased; but how do you know it? And how do you know but that in the future state his temptations to sin will be proportioned to his motives to virtue exactly as they are in this present state of being?

If our spiritual advantages in another world are to be no greater than they are here, can we be confident that all will duly appreciate and employ them? If in the future world our helps to holiness are to be greater, and our hindrances less, and if the success of these future means is certain, why should so much have been done and suffered to bring men to repentance before death? And if the future is to be a so much better school of reform, and one which will not fail to accomplish its object; would it not be an encouragement to many to undervalue and neglect their present opportunities? It seems to me that such would be its tendency; at least, such often appears to be its result. But the main point to settle, is, whether it be a doctrine of divine revelation; if it be, its tendency must be good, if properly used. A true doctrine may be abused.

I was somewhat surprised to find you expressing yourself in the following language—"As a simple proposition, declared in so many words on every leaf of the Bible, it [the doctrine of a final restoration] would have been worth infinitely less than it now is. *Then*, men would have taken it up with little or no inquiry into the nature of those principles on which it rests. It would have led its believer to none of that investigation, analy-

sis, and profound thought, which it now requires. It would have been taken for granted without reflection, and consequently with little benefit to the soul." My dear Sir, my heart does not respond with approbation to such sentiments. My thoughts and sympathies are with the multitude —with that numerous class of my fellow-beings, to whom such "investigation," "analysis" and "profound thought," must be exceedingly difficult, if not impossible. Do not the ignorant, the weak-minded, the poor, the sick, the afflicted, need religion? Why then should one of its most important doctrines require such a laborious research, and such mental exertions? What you consider an excellency in your doctrine, I should rather regard as a defect. If the doctrine is important to all, it should be intelligible to all. Those of the meanest capacities and in the humbler walks of life need a mild and merciful religion as well as the favoured few. Had the doctrine of universal restoration been plainly inscribed on every leaf of the Bible, I must think, after all you say, that it would have made a deeper impression, and it would have gained a more general belief; and then, you would only have to urge your hearers to reduce their faith to practice. I have considered it one of the excellencies of the Christian religion, that its doctrines and precepts were plain and simple; so plain and simple that the common people could gain such a knowledge of them as was necessary in order to their becoming Christians. When I read the Athanasian Creed, the Assembly's Catechism, Calvin's Institutes, and Hopkins's System, I think of the thousands who must die without religion, if a firm and clear faith in all these dogmas be necessary to render one religious.

We are taught to be holy, perfect, and merciful, as our Heavenly Father is, and you think we are commanded to be more merciful than he is, if he does not render all finally holy and happy; and therefore if your doctrine is not true, you cannot exhibit the Divine character as a model worthy of imitation. But admitting that God does give us an opportunity to do and be in this life all that he requires in order to our acceptance, why is his goodness questioned, because we remain sinful? He can never love sin, till he ceases to be a Holy God. Love and mercy have their bounds and conditions. We cannot esteem others except in proportion to their virtues; nor can God regard us with approbation except in proportion to our conformity to his will. The sinner must make holiness his choice. Why may he not choose to remain unholy in another world as well as in this?

We are required to have the spirit and mind of Christ—to resemble him —to imitate him. And yet he tells us of some to whom he will say, "I know you not! Depart from me!" Those who have been ashamed of him and denied him, he will be ashamed of and deny. The Scriptures certainly seem to encourage the belief, that there will be a time, when the day of grace will be gone, when the gate of mercy will be shut. If it seems a dreadful thought that such a time should ever be, let it excite us to greater watchfulness, and to greater diligence and earnestness in exhorting others to prepare to meet their God—to seek him while he may be found, and to call upon him while he is near. That we may successfully strive to enter in at the strait gate, so run that we may obtain, and that we may be wise to win souls, is the prayer of your friend and brother,

JONATHAN FARR.

REV. ADIN BALLOU.

MONTHLY LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS,

JUST RECEIVED BY

JAMES MUNROE AND CO.

Life of Mrs. Siddons, by Thomas Campbell.
Life of Andrew Jackson, by W. Cobbett.
Counsels to Young Men on Modern Infidelity, by John Morison, D. D. 18mo.
Coleridge's Poetical Works. Aldine Edition. Vol. I. and II. 16mo.
Combe's Lectures on Popular Education. 12mo.
Spirit of Hebrew Poetry, by J. G. Herder. Translated by James Marsh. 2 vols. 12mo.
The Remains of Rev. Charles Henry Wharton, D. D. With a Memoir of his Life, by George Washington Doane, D. D. 12mo.
Memoirs of Vidocq, Principal Agent of the French Police until 1827. Written by himself. 8vo.
Paragraph Bible; in which the Common Translation is arranged in Paragraphs, such as the sense requires; the Divisions of Chapters and Verses being noted in the Margin, for reference, by James Nourse. 18mo.
——— Testament, by James Nourse. 18mo.
Youth's Letter Writer, by Mrs. John Farrar. 32mo.
Schmucker's Elements of Popular Theology. 8vo.
Stuart's Grammar of the New Testament Dialect. 8vo.
Harmony of the Gospels, in Greek, in the general order of Le Clerc and Newcombe. Edited by Edward Robinson. 8vo.
Letters to the Young, by Miss Jewsbury. 12mo.
Folchetto Malaspina; from the Italian, by Daniel J. Desmond. 2 vols. 12mo.
Tales of the Garden of Kosciuszko, by Samuel L. Knapp. 12mo.

JAMES MUNROE & CO.

HAVE JUST RECEIVED FROM

THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION

THE FOLLOWING INVOICE OF

VALUABLE ENGLISH WORKS.

Unitarianism the Doctrine of the Gospel, by Lant Carpenter, 3d edition.
Farmer's Dissertation on Miracles, 3d edition.
Farmer's Essay on the Demoniacs of the N. Testament, 3d edition.
Priestley's Memoirs, with Observations on his Writings, by T. Cooper and W. Christie; and Four Posthumous Discourses, 2 vols.
Milton's Last Thoughts on the Trinity.
Bible Stories, Part 2d, containing Stories from the N. Testament, by S. Wood.
Price's Four Dissertations, 5th edition.
Belsham's Translation and Exposition of Paul's Epistles, with Notes, 4 vols.
Belsham's Memoirs of Lindsey, 2d edition.
Traité où l'on Expose ce que l'Ecriture nous apprend de la Divinité de Jésus Christ, par P. F. Le Courayer.
Cellérier's Discourse on the Authenticity and Divine Origin of the Old Testament, with Notes and Illustrations; translated from the French by J. R. Wreford.
Tagart on the Claims of Unitarian Christianity to the Respectful Consideration of the Reflecting Public.
Barker's Church-Establishment Anti-Christian, &c.
Harris's Harmony of Nature, Providence, and Christianity.
Review of Smith's Scripture Testimony to the Messiah.
Orthodoxy and Unbelief, by Ed. Higginson.
Joyce's Analysis of Paley's View of the Evidences of Christianity, 7th edition.
The Word made Flesh: A Sermon before the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, by W. Hincks.
Ashworth's Account of the Rise and Progress of the Unitarian Doctrine in the Societies at Rochdale, 2d edition.
Brief Dissertation on the Ministration of the Divine Word by Public Preaching, by Rob. Robinson.
Priestley's Unitarianism Explained and Defended.
Priestley's Outline of the Evidences of Revealed Religion.
Lardner's Letter on the Logos.
Yates on the Unity of God.
Whyte's Sermons on Doctrinal and Practical Subjects, 2d edition.

JAMES MUNROE AND CO.

HAVE JUST PUBLISHED,

Ware's Life of the Saviour, *stereotype edition.*

Lowth's Isaiah, from the tenth English edition, carefully corrected and revised.

Stewart's Philosophy of the Human Mind. 8vo. 2d ed.

Briggs's Sermon at the Installation of Rev. A. B. Muzzey.

Wood's Discourse, on Gospel-Truths.

Two Discourses delivered before the First Parish in Cambridge; one, upon leaving the Old Meeting House, and the other, at the Dedication of the New. By William Newell, Pastor of the First Church in Cambridge.

Sunday-School and Parish Libraries will be promptly furnished to order, on the most liberal terms.

Orders for any work published either in this country or in Europe will be attended to without delay.

The establishment of an hourly communication with the city, by coaches and baggage-wagons, enables us to assure distant customers of the execution of all orders transmitted by mail, with about the same despatch as can be had in Boston.

Liberal terms will be allowed to authors who may favour us with the publication of their works. No pains will be spared to bring out all books in good style and with despatch, and to give them extensive circulation.

Hilliard and Gray, Printers, Cambridge.

David Lake fr.

THE

Stanford Library
MAY 15 1945
B

UNITARIAN.

Vol. I. No. 11.

NOVEMBER, 1834.

CONDUCTED

BY BERNARD WHITMAN.

CAMBRIDGE
AND
BOSTON:
JAMES MUNROE AND COMPANY,
BOOKSELLERS TO THE UNIVERSITY.
1834.

This number contains 2 sheets — Postage, under 100 miles, 3 cents — over 100 miles, 5 cents.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
Christ the Teacher of Immortality. A. P. Peabody.	495
Letter addressed to Rev. L. W. Concluded. Q. P. O.	504
The Prosperity of its Societies the True Policy of a Sect. T. R. Sullivan.	508
The Unitarian Heresy. C. T. Brooks.	517
Letters to Unbelievers. No. V. *Religious Belief of Benjamin Franklin.* B. Whitman.	522
Considerations for Philosophical Rejecters of the Christian Faith. C. A. B.	528

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Owen's Exposition on Psalm CXXX.	536

CORRESPONDENCE AND INTELLIGENCE.

Fifth Letter to the Rev. Adin Ballou.	538
The Boston Sunday-School Society.	541
Ordinations and Installation.	542

The Unitarian is issued in monthly numbers, by James Munroe and Co., *Cambridge, Mass.* Each number will contain, on an average, 48 pages royal 12mo., [i. e. octavo size], and be printed on good paper and with handsome type. The price will be two dollars per annum, payable on the first of March. To those who procure and become responsible for six subscribers a seventh copy will be furnished *gratis*. The usual discount to Agents. All business letters to be addressed to the publishers.

☞ Our Subscribers are reminded that payment became due on the receipt of the March number. Gentlemen to whom subscription-papers were sent are respectfully requested to collect and forward to the publishers, James Munroe & Co., Cambridge, Mass., the amount due from the several subscribers whose names they have sent us.

It is particularly requested of our subscribers to make their payments in Massachusetts' or United States' Bank Notes; since the discount on all other bills involves a considerable loss.

It is intended to notice all the books and pamphlets which may be received, so far as they fall within the plan of this work. It is, therefore, respectfully requested of authors and publishers to forward copies of such publications.

The Editor will hold himself responsible for no articles except his own.

This Day Published,

BY

JAMES MUNROE & CO.,

Booksellers to the University.

Views of Christian Truth, Piety, and Morality, selected from the Writings of Dr. Priestley, with an Introductory Notice of his Life and Character. By Rev. Henry Ware, Jr.

Volume III. of Ware's Sunday Library, being *The Holy Land and its Inhabitants.* By Rev. S. G. Bulfinch, of Augusta, Georgia. Illustrated by a Map of Judea.

Cambridge, June 1, 1834.

THE UNITARIAN.

VOL. I. NOVEMBER 1, 1834. No. 11.

Christ the Teacher of Immortality.

WE enjoy two distinct sources of religious knowledge,—*nature* and *revelation*. To which of these do we owe our knowledge of a future state? Does the light of nature incontrovertibly prove such a state? Or has Christ alone the words of eternal life, so that, had he not come into the world, no man could have had sufficient reason to expect existence after death? The latter is my own opinion. And, in order to prove it, I shall examine separately the principal arguments which are offered, independently of revelation, for a future state of existence; and shall attempt to show that they are not only insufficient, but of themselves weak. But in doing this, I wish it to be distinctly understood that, while I regard all these arguments together as furnishing no adequate *proof* of man's immortality, I value them highly as *confirming* the Christian doctrine of immortality. Far be it from me to extinguish the light of nature, that I may make that of the gospel shine the brighter. They are both lights which God's own hand has kindled in the moral firmament,—but that of nature is the lesser light, and never beams so brightly as when it borrows lustre from the written word.

1. Perhaps no argument is urged more frequently in favour of man's immortality than the *general consent* of men of different ages and nations. But this consent was by no means general before the promulgation of Christianity. The ancient Egyptians had no idea of any immortality beyond that which the art of embalming may be said, almost without hyperbole, to have conferred on the body. There certainly is not in the Pentateuch, I doubt whether there can be found in the

whole of the Old Testament, a single distinct recognition of the doctrine of a future life; and in our Saviour's time it was denied by a large and influential sect among the Jews. Among the ancient Greeks and Romans the immortality of the soul was the subject of hope rather than of belief among the common people; was rejected by several of the most learned and numerous sects of philosophers; and was called in question even by Socrates and Cicero, who are often cited as firm believers in it. Its partial prevalence may be easily accounted for. It must have necessarily suggested itself as possible to many minds; and, when the possibility of a life after death was once suggested, thousands would embrace the belief simply from their love of life and desire of its continuance.

Since the promulgation of Christianity, a belief in the immortality of the soul has been prevalent among all the nations with which Christians have been conversant,—and for a very adequate reason,—because they have been conversant with Christians, have heard from them the chief doctrine of their system, and have transplanted it into their own systems as congenial with their feelings and desires. The New Hollanders and other recently discovered nations, that had had no previous intercourse with Christians, have been found to be wholly ignorant of a future state.

But even supposing that the belief in a future state had been universal, if this universal consent were the only argument that our neighbours, that the Hindoo, that the Tartar, that the Roman, that Plato, that Socrates could offer, we should have no valid ground for believing with the rest of mankind. Universal consent and for a long time together, has time and again been given to propositions which we now deem false and absurd. The time has often been in the history of the world when universal consent would have testified to the existence, not of one Supreme Divinity, but of gods many and lords many. With the exception of Jacob and his posterity, all mankind for more than two thousand years would have borne testimony, almost without a dissenting voice, against the unity of God. Universal consent cannot then be pleaded as a sufficient ground for our belief in man's immortality.

2. *The death of young children* has been offered as furnishing a strong presumption in favour of a future state of existence. It is said that, unless they pass hence into another life, there is an unprecedented waste of creative power,—a

waste inconsistent with the divine wisdom. But, admitting that in this case there is an apparent waste of creative power, is this waste unprecedented? Do we not see in every department of the divine government a superfluity of results? Thus it must be, so long as uniformity of operation is maintained. The rain falls upon the ocean, the barren sea-shore, the mountain crag, as well as upon the forest, field, and garden. The richest fruits ripen and pass away untasted. The oak extends its shade where neither man nor beast reposes beneath it. The sun and moon shed their beams upon the pathless desert as well as upon the haunts of men. Though in the eye of God we believe that nothing wants its use and its end, yet to human vision many things are made in vain.

But in fact this apparent waste of creative power does not take place with regard to the infant. However short life may have been, he has not lived in vain. He has probably enjoyed more than he has suffered. He has called into exercise the strongest and purest affections of the human heart; and his departure has been a means of salutary moral discipline. Besides, the possibility of the death of infants offers an additional motive to parental diligence and fidelity, and augments the ardour of parental affection. It also deepens in men's minds a sense of their constant liability to death, and of the necessity of being constantly prepared for it. Thus, though the lamp of life be hardly kindled ere it be quenched never again to be rekindled, its short-lived burning has served important purposes; and therefore, though the highest consolation that a Christian parent can receive for the loss of a child results from the belief that the child has been removed to a better world, he has no right from the bare fact of his child's death to infer the existence of that better world.

3. *The strength of the social affections* is urged as an argument in favour of the immortality of the soul. It is said that a benevolent God would not have endowed men with the capacity of forming friendships so intimate, so tender, unless he had designed that these friendships should be indissoluble. But is it not a belief in the indissolubleness of friendship that makes friendship thus strong? Are not Christians, who entertain as firm a faith in their eternal, as they have in their present existence, the very persons who most frequently form attachments which neither distance, nor danger, nor death can dissolve? And is not the idea of their eternal duration the most important element in forming and perfecting such attachments? I doubt very much whether an attachment of

that character and intensity ever subsisted between two Atheists, or between two persons who had no idea of a future state. Indeed the personal and domestic history of infidelity during its late reign in France, is so full of suspicion, jealousy, and perfidy, as to force upon the mind the conviction that cordial and ardent friendship cannot subsist among unbelievers.*

Moreover, is not much that is said about the strength and permanence even of virtuous friendship, mere hyperbole? Do not those whose hearts, interests, and hopes seemed one, soon and easily overcome the grief of parting? I know that there are instances in which persons go mourning all their days for the early death of some cherished relative or companion. But these instances are always spoken of as remarkable,—are regarded as exceptions to the general rule. In most cases, a bereaved individual after a few weeks or months recovers his buoyancy of spirit, is able to enter anew with his former interest upon the business and the pleasures of life, and to form new friendships in lieu of that which has been dissolved. Not that man is hard-hearted. But God has graciously endowed his mind with an elasticity, by which it can buoy itself up and throw off the heaviest pressure. And does not this comparatively speedy and easy recovery from the loss of valued friends weaken greatly the argument drawn from our social connexions in favour of a future life?

Further, suppose that we waive the foregoing considerations, and admit in its full force the argument for a future life drawn from the strength of earthly attachments, it will prove too much,—it will prove more than any of us would be willing to admit. We discern in the brute creation the traces of deeper and more permanent attachment, and of more poignant anguish at bereavement, than we often witness in man. He who could hear the orphan's or widow's wail unmoved, could hardly refrain from weeping with the turtle-dove whose mate has become the fowler's victim. Bereavement seldom occasions death to the human mourner; but dogs and horses have often died sorrow-stricken upon the graves of their masters. And now if, on the ground of the strength and permanence of earthly attachments, we suppose a future life where *human* friendships will be renewed we must on the

* Numerous illustrations of the remark in the text might be drawn from such works as Rousseau's Confessions, Marmontel's Memoirs, the Life of Diderot, &c.

same ground suppose also a paradise where the turtle-dove will meet her lost and mourned one, and the dog caress the master whom he loved more than his own life. But the immortality of the brute creation no sane man in this enlightened age will admit; and an argument that proves too much proves nothing. The nature of the social affections then affords no sufficient argument in favour of man's immortality.

4. But how is it with *man's capacity of intellectual improvement?* It is often said that, unless man were designed for continued existence, it would have been useless to have given him a mind capable of indefinite improvement. But how do we know that the mind is capable of indefinite improvement? This is not an independent truth, but a corollary from the doctrine of immortality. We find the mind capable of improvement through the whole of the present life, and argue from analogy that it will be so through the whole of the future life, and therefore that it is capable of indefinite improvement. But if we do not derive from some foreign source the fact of the mind's continued existence, we can assert nothing of its capacities except what has been verified in human experience and observation. Suppose, for instance, that Newton, when at the acme of his intellectual greatness, had the loftiest and strongest mind that ever tenanted a human body, how know we that our minds have any inherent capacity of going beyond what his was? We are conscious that there is room for improvement; but, when we have measured the distance between what we are and what he was, we have measured all the room for improvement of which we have cognizance,—we have reached, so far as we know, the limits of human capacity.

But, suppose that we were conscious of an inherent capacity in human nature of reaching intellectual strength and attainments vastly beyond those that have been reached in this world by any human being, there may yet be room even here for the exercise of the loftiest powers of mind of which we can conceive. Other races of animals remain unimproved and unimprovable century after century. Man alone improves from generation to generation; and, through the power of speech and the art of writing, the improvements of each may be transmitted to every subsequent generation, and each may enter at once upon that portion of the career at which the preceding left it. Thus truths which a century ago constituted the *arcana* of a scientific few, are now taught as axioms in the nursery. Thus an intelligent child of twelve years of

age, at the present day, probably knows more of mathematical, physical, and moral science than Cicero knew on the day of his death; and the time may come when the lisping infant will laugh to scorn the wisdom of the wisest of our cotemporaries. The past, when viewed with philosophic eye, exhibits an uninterrupted progress of the human mind; and we have therefore good reason to anticipate a similar progress for all future time, so that all man's intellectual powers may one day be called into exercise even here. Man's high intellectual capacities do not then incontrovertibly prove a future state.

5. *The unequal distribution of happiness and misery in this life* is farther urged by those who would prove a future life independently of revelation. It is asserted that there is no such thing as a righteous retribution here, and that, in order to maintain the divine impartiality, we must suppose a future state where the inequalities of the present life will be rectified,—and where virtue will be rewarded, and the sinner will eat of the fruit of his doings.

But is retribution thus imperfect in the present state? I admit that the *external* favours of Providence are indiscriminately conferred. But is their conferment of itself a blessing? How often are they the sources of splendid misery, the means of sin, the snares of the soul! Is the loss or want of them a curse? How often is it a means of moral culture, a source of moral power, a fountain of spiritual happiness! The body is not the seat of joy or of sorrow. Its every craving may be satiated, while the soul that tenants it suffers most intensely. Its whole frame may be convulsed or marred, while the mind is not only calm, but joyous. Vice is misery, virtue happiness, wherever found. Would you see the real sufferer? Seek for him whom the estate of the widow or the fatherless has arrayed in scarlet, who fares sumptuously on the spoils of the needy, whose abode is the paradise of sin. Seek for him who has mounted by an unholy path to the summit of ambition. Seek for him who enjoys the respect of every one but himself. And would you see the truly happy man? Behold him who lives in poverty, because he would not enrich himself with the wages of sin. Behold the wounded patriot on the field of victory. Behold Socrates giving lessons of virtue while the poison discharges its deadly office. Behold the martyr in the midst of the flames, his parched lips raising the song of triumph. But if the friends of virtue are in this life happy in proportion to their virtue, and the votaries of vice miserable in proportion to their sinfulness, justice is in fact

administered here,—a righteous retribution takes place here, and the divine impartiality is vindicated without supposing a future state of being.

But let us suppose for a moment that a perfect retribution does not take place in this world, what proof then have we of the divine impartiality? Observation furnishes none. Analogy furnishes none,—it even furnishes a presumption to the contrary; for in our fellow-men we see benevolence much more frequently than justice, and often see lavish generosity united with extreme capriciousness in the bestowal of favours. And if in the government of God we discern an arbitrariness in the bestowal of favours, and a neglect of strict justice in the distribution of rewards and punishments, the inference of unenlightened reason would be that he, like too many of his creatures is essentially capricious and partial. Unless God manifests himself as a just as well as a good being, it is impossible to demonstrate his justice, and we therefore have no right to assume it in order to prove man's immortality. The alledged imperfection of the present state furnishes then no adequate proof of a future state, in which the inequalities of the present will be rectified.

6. The last argument in favour of man's immortality drawn from considerations independent of divine revelation which I shall at this time notice, is that derived from the *immateriality of the soul.* It is said that material agents have no power over spirit,—that the causes which lead to the dissolution of the body cannot suspend the operations of the mind,—that there is no reason why the soul, simple, etherial, spiritual as it is in its essence, should cease to exist at death. This reasoning of course supposes the immateriality of the soul to be a doctrine of natural religion or of metaphysical science. I confess that I cannot regard in it that light. I cannot but regard the immateriality of the thinking principle as altogether a doctrine of revelation,—as a corollary from the Christian doctrine of immortality.

A very superficial observation of the phenomena of body and mind might indeed lead us to suppose that the mind existed independently of material organization. We find that the body may be mutilated, may be in a state of entire prostration or of rapid decay, while the mind retains its full vigour. At the approach of dissolution the intellectual powers are often intensely active, triumphing over decay, putting forth at the moment of emancipation an energy to which in seasons of health they had been strangers. And one might naturally

argue from these things that the principle which mutilation, pain, infirmity, and decay affect not, would survive them all,—would survive death of which they are the harbingers and causes. But carry the inquiry a little farther. Recur to the recent disclosures of anatomical research. See how exactly the degree of intellect is apportioned in each instance to the quantity and advantageous location of the brain. Touch that brain. Let external force compress it, let a fever inflame it, let an aqueous secretion relax its texture; and where is the man?—the reasoning, reflecting man? Where is the master mind? Its once gifted possessor is a maniac or an ideot; and remains so for life, or until the cause which made him so is removed. Are not emotion, thought, and volition then *material* phenomena? That they are so the mere physiologist must confess. That they are so, did not my Bible teach me differently, I should be constrained to admit. But, when I read there that man is not the creature of a day, but the sharer of his Maker's immortality,—when I see Christ, the herald of eternal life, attesting, by mighty works, the divinity of his mission,—when the chief of his apostles informs me that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God,—when I consider that the cannibal often dies with the flesh of his fellow-man incorporated in his own,—when I reflect that, were the archangel's trumpet at this moment to sound the signal for a material resurrection, every particle of dust in my body, would find hundreds of revivified claimants,—then, and not till then, am I convinced that there is a spirit in man,—a spirit which emanated from the Father of Spirits, and which, when it leaves the world, must return to Him for judgment. In fine, I believe the thinking principle to be immaterial, simply because the Bible assures me that it is immortal, and I know from its very nature that no modification of matter can be immortal.

But, admitting the immateriality of the soul to be established by considerations independent of revelation, still it is far from proving man's immortality. If the soul be immaterial, it cannot indeed be changed or destroyed by *material* agents. But it may be put out of existence by Him who brought it into existence. God cannot light up a fire which it is out of his own power to extinguish. The soul, no less than the body, must depend entirely upon his will and the constant effort of his power for every moment of its existence. And therefore, in order to assure us that it will exist for ever, we need his word, his express promise that he will preserve

it in existence. The immateriality of the soul then, even if it could be proved independently of revelation, does not of itself prove man's immortality.

Thus have we seen that the doctrine of immortality, as an article of *natural* religion, rests on but a slender foundation. Thus it must be from the very nature of the case. For how can a system of things liable to constant change, decay, and dissolution give us unwavering assurance respecting an eternity which will be but begun, when the heavens shall pass away and the earth shall be no more? Truths pertaining to eternity must from their very nature be subjects only for *testimony*. God's existence, power, providence, wisdom, and mercy may be and are *manifested*. Nature, though she has no audible voice, bears speechless testimony to them day and night without ceasing. But we needed *words* of eternal life. And, thanks be to God, Christ has uttered those words upon earth; and God has borne testimony to him and with him by a voice from the most excellent glory, by such works as no man could do unless God were with him, by raising up from the dead the herald of immortal life.

We are then to look to Christ primarily for the doctrine of eternal life. Let not however the design of the foregoing discussion be mistaken. In attempting to show that the natural arguments in favour of man's immortality are not of themselves conclusive, I do not mean to undervalue them, on the other hand I prize them highly, as collateral and accessory arguments. When the light of immortality from the gospel beams upon the expanse of nature, it shines with new lustre; and we see throughout the visible universe the image of things invisible and eternal. A thousand analogies present themselves to confirm the teachings of revelation. Nature, which, till Christ spake the words of eternal life, spake them not, now utters them forth full, loud, and clear. The heavens are clothed in purer lustre, the earth in richer beauty, as the dawning rays of eternity rest upon them.

> Bright is the golden sun above,
> And beautiful the flowers that bloom,
> And all is joy, and all is love,
> Reflected from the world to come.

The reader may perhaps ask, if we believe in man's immortality, what matters it whether we regard it as a doctrine of natural religion confirmed by Christ, or a doctrine of revelation confirmed by nature? To this question the general answer might be made, that, in order to defend a doctrine, it

is necessary to know on what ground it properly rests. But there are two important practical uses which may be made of the view of this subject presented in the foregoing article.

1. If we depend upon Christ mainly for the doctrine of immortality, we shall cherish the deeper reverence for the Christian revelation and its records. If the New Testament only passed a sentence of confirmation on doctrines previously established,—if it were only a codification of the laws or principles of natural religion, it would be precious indeed, but not inestimable. It would barely simplify and accelerate the work which our own experience and observation might perform without it. But if the most momentous, the most interesting, the most glorious truth that relates to our nature and our destiny, be strictly and exclusively a doctrine of the New Testament, then that volume is indeed our richest treasure, and Christ, next to God, the most worthy object of our gratitude and love.

2. Deists are fond of holding out the idea that a Christian, by renouncing Christianity, need not give up the doctrine of eternal life. They maintain that it is a doctrine of natural religion, which the impostors who promulgated Christianity borrowed thence to gain the popular favour. Now he, who believes nature adequate to teach this all-important truth, will yield himself more readily to the influence of those who would lead him to deny the gospel and the Saviour.

If the reasoning of the foregoing pages have been in the main just, it behoves us to cherish eternal life as *the gift of God through Jesus Christ*. Let us contemplate nature with wonder, love, and adoration. But let us not think to guide our steps, and to gain support, consolation, and joy by her dictates alone. Her light was indeed precious, when its dim, moon-like lustre gleamed upon a world sunk in superstition and sin. But upon us the Sun of Righteousness has dawned. Lord to whom else then should we go? Thou alone hast the words of eternal life.

Letter addressed to Rev. L. W.

[Concluded from page 483.]

We pass now to the practical use of the doctrine of the Trinity. You represented that it is of great importance, to understand the grounds and consistency of the work of re-

demption; and, of course, to know the natural dignity of the agent by whom this great work has been accomplished. You appeared to assume this principle; that *as mankind are rational beings, they ought to exercise their understanding in the matter of religion*, and in the use of it, come to an acquaintance with the consistency and dependence of its different parts. I have, Sir, been surprised at hearing Trinitarians so strongly assert the importance of *well understanding the grounds and proprieties of religious doctrine:* at hearing them so confidently declare that the Lord Jesus Christ must have been *truly God*, or he would not have been competent to work out salvation for those on behalf of whom he came down from heaven: at hearing them unhesitatingly declare that their hope of salvation in Christ would totally fail them, the moment they should cease to believe that he is, in the highest and most proper sense, *Divine* and *Almighty*:—when, however, that objections are urged against the doctrine of the Trinity, their tone of sentiment and language is different. The peals and the changes are then rung on other bells. *It is carnal reason; the pride of human reasoning; and the setting up of the feeble and darkened understanding of man above the truth and the holy word of God.* Your introduction, Sir, was employed on this very topic; and so was one of your inferences. And what, Sir, is the import and amount of this? Did you not *reason*, and *reason with all your might*, in that very discourse? It was, perhaps, the most argumentative sermon you ever wrote. You probably never gave a better example of your *logical strength*. The obvious *purpose of the discourse* was to sustain the doctrine *by argument*. And yet, both in the beginning and in the ending, you inveighed against the "pride of human reasoning." Did you, Sir, intend no more than to say, that Christians should receive the plain and unambiguous declarations of Scripture, *without reasoning against them?* No. I cordially unite with you. And in the use of this principle, the question of the Trinity, may, I think, soon be settled. For the following declarations are plain and unambiguous. "The Lord our God is one." "The Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," "is the only living and true God." "To us there is one God the Father, and one Lord Jesus Christ," "the Mediator between God and man." But, Sir, you were not satisfied with the obvious import of these sacred passages. *And you reason against them.* You make a laboured argument to prove that the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is *not*, though it is expressly

declared that he is, the *only* true God. You maintain that he is one of the three equal persons in the Godhead.

And do you now reply, that it is proper and requisite *to compare* one passage of Scripture with another, *and to reason* from them? I grant it: we must do it. And let us not, for so doing, accuse, and rail at, each other.

Trinitarians, in regard to this thing, ought not to cast the first stone. They, certainly, *are not exceeded by their adversaries* in the employment of argumentative reasoning. And they have reasoned with uncommon abstruseness and subtilty: have drawn lines confessedly so fine as to be imperceptible to their own eyes: they have, as others think, assumed premises on presumption, and by attenuated logic, deduced inferences from them, of a very unsatisfactory and problematical character.

I recollect once hearing a Trinitarian minister discourse on the proceedings of the day of judgment. He earnestly insisted on *this* point; that *all the sins of the impenitent-wicked would, and must, then be revealed to the great assembly of mankind*, for otherwise the righteous, the heirs of salvation, *could not be satisfied that the punishment of them was proportionate and just!* Where, then, it may be asked, is their *confidence in the perfect wisdom and rectitude of God?* May not, and ought not, all intelligent beings to have an entire faith in the infallible equity of God, though the particular reasons of his dispensations are not made known? And as he hath set forth the Lord Jesus Christ, as the all-competent Saviour of them who receive and obey him, is it a mark of becoming humility, is it an act consistent with dutifulness, for us to say,—*that unless this Redeemer, divinely constituted, be truly and properly God, he is inadequate to the work, and we can put no trust in him?*

God hath pronounced the Lord Jesus Christ to be his own Son, invested with power over all flesh; able to give eternal life to as many as obey him. Therefore, though the natural character of the Son be what it may, *he is certainly adequate to the work of redemption.* For him hath God the Father sealed. If then, we receive the testimony of God concerning his Son, all doubt and disputation about his competency for the office he sustains is at once foreclosed. With what propriety, then, can a Christian say (and many have said it)—"Convince me that the Son is not equal to the Father, and I am destitute of the hope of eternal life." To say this, Sir, is it not to exalt human reason? And is it not to exalt it very

high? Did Dr. Priestley, Sir, with all his offensive temerity, ever stretch himself beyond this point of confidence in human reason? If I do not misremember, that fearless man once expressed a sentiment like the following; "If I knew that the Evangelist intended to affirm that the Son of Man existed in heaven before he was born upon earth, I should not decline to say, *that he must have laboured under some mistake.*" And the Rev. John Wesley declared, in substance, that "whatever language the Apostle Paul used on the subject of election, in the ninth chapter of his Epistle to the Romans, he could not have intended to advance what is now called *Calvinistic doctrine* of election and reprobation, because that doctrine is *false, blasphemous,* and *damnable.*" These men, it is evident, placed no inconsiderable reliance on their own understanding, as to its office in the formation of their religious opinions; but I submit the question, Sir, whether they must not yield to that *Trinitarian* who undertakes to decide *à priori* and positively, *what it was expedient for God to do,* in order consistently to provide a way of salvation for mankind, and to pronounce the way which *He hath constituted,* unless based on the doctrine of a Divine Trinity, *inefficient: a manifest and an entire failure.*

One word more, Sir, in this connection. In your peroration, and near the close of it, having laid your hand on the Holy Book, and casting your eye around on the audience, with much expression in your manner, you said: "If the doctrine of the Trinity be not contained in this book, it has deceived me; it is unsafe for me to trust in its testimony; for what confidence can I have in its declarations on any subject, after it has deceived me upon one? My dear Sir, you must be under some mistake. *You never learned the doctrine of the Trinity from the Bible.* It is not the Sacred Volume that has deceived you, on the supposition that the doctrine, concerning which you then spake, be not true. It is not presumption in me to say this. Children who read the Bible, without the interference of commentaries, written or verbal, will imbibe sentiments of religion. But no one ever imbibed that of the Trinity. You Sir, would not have learned that doctrine, even at your present time of life, had you not read and heard Trinitarian discourses.

I well know a man, who when young was uncommonly addicted to the reading of the Scriptures. In a manner, the Bible was his manual day by day, from the time he rose in the morning to the hour when he lay down at night. And

he now distinctly recollects the first impression he ever had of what has long been considered *the true doctrine of the Trinity*. It was suggested by revolving in his mind that passage of the Catechism; "*These three are one God, the same in substance, and equal in power and in glory.*" He had never conceived the Son to be the true God, and equal to the Father. And his ideas of the Son had been taken from the New Testament. And the thought of the equality of the Divine Persons *greatly surprised him*, being totally different from what he had previously conceived. Still he had no disposition to reject or to doubt it, for he had equal confidence in the Catechism and in the Bible.

Though this fact, Sir, proves nothing in regard to the Trinity, whether the doctrine be true or false, yet it is not irrelevant to the inquiry; *from what source come our first conception and belief of the Three Co-equal Persons in the Godhead?* The strong presumption is that you, Sir, derived yours from the Assembly's Catechism. Can you, from distinct recollection, say that the fact is different? What impression would an unbiassed mind naturally receive from the following declarations: "This is my beloved Son." "Now is the Son of Man glorified and God is glorified in him." "Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he was come from God and went to God." "As the Father hath given me commandment, even so I do." "I will pray the Father and he shall give you another Comforter." "The Father in me, he doeth the work." "My Father is greater than I."—Could any man, Sir, young or old, whose mind was unshackled, receive any other impression from these, and a hundred more similar passages, than that the Father was the *only true God*, and that the Son was *another* Being? And I will propose the question to you, Sir, *whether you do honestly believe that an enlightened man, reading the Bible over and over again, but receiving no religious communications from other sources, would come to the knowledge of distinct Persons, each of whom is equally the true God?* Will you venture to affirm? Q. P. O.

The Prosperity of its Societies the true Policy of a Sect.

The word *schism*, as used in the New Testament, relates to alienation of feeling rather than to difference of opinion. It is applied to the multitude in reference to Jesus. "There

was a division (schism) among the people on account of him;" i. e. our Lord, towards whom some of them were favourably disposed, while others were dissatisfied. It is applied to a particular church. "I hear there are divisions (schisms) among you." What constituted the union thus violated? Mutual love. "Their hearts were knit together in love." "Love," says Dr. Campbell (to whom we are indebted for the comment above), "was the criterion of Christian character, and the foundation of Christian unity. Mutual affection was the union; *alienation of heart* was the *schism.*" In later times the term *schism* has been appropriated to separation from communion in religious offices; and a *schismatic* regarded the same as a *separatist*, in respect to the ordinances of religion; but this is not the scriptural sense of the word.

"That there should be no schism in the body." "I hear there are divisions (schisms) among you." These passages relate to the same persons, and the same thing; the Corinthian church, and the animosities and discordant spirit of some of its members.

It is our present object to collect the light which the above and other testimonies of Scripture throw upon the following points, viz., the *distinctive character* and *obligations*, the *wants*, the *interests*, and the *policy* of a Christian Society.

Let it be remembered that the word *ecclesia*, translated church, signifies originally an assembly of any kind, and was applied in the New Testament to those who habitually met to worship in one place as Christians, not referring, however, as the word *church* very commonly does now, particularly to the communion of the Lord's supper, although it was anciently the custom of all believers, without distinction, to partake in this ordinance; the young being admitted to it after a certain age, and after going through a course of instruction in the Christian faith. By the word *ecclesia* in the New Testament is to be understood therefore, a regularly organized Christian assembly or society. The distinction between the church and the congregation was of later origin. "As soon as in any place converts were found sufficient to form a society or church, a bishop or presbyter was ordained for life to minister to them."* "The two terms," (bishop and presbyter,) says Mosheim, "were undoubtedly applied to the same order of men. The churches, thus constituted, formed a sort of federative body of independent, religious communities, dis-

* Library of Useful Knowledge.

persed through the greater part of the empire, in continual communication, and in constant harmony with each other."* This state of things is said to have continued until "towards the end of the second century." Such were the first or primitive churches, to which the Congregational societies of modern times bear a nearer resemblance, in the matter of form, than any other.

Christians thus associated, or forming a church, not only belonged to the body of Christ, but were a distinct community of themselves; the obligations arising in such a community being recognised by the apostolic writers, and much of the preceptive and admonitory parts of the Epistles being founded upon them. This marks an important distinction. There were some relations and duties extending to the body of Christ, the whole new Israel of God, to which all the Christian societies in common belonged; and there were other relations and duties having their origin and end in the church or society with which the individual was particularly connected. This is what we mean by the *distinctive* character of a Christian society. The disciples of Christ were indeed taught to regard no child of Adam as unclean, or as having no claim to their good offices, but they were exhorted to be the most abundant in them where opportunity the most favoured; they were to do good to all men, but especially to those who were of the household of faith; they were to work no man evil, but they were to edify one another. As members of a Christian society they were entreated to be "like-minded," having the same love, being of one accord, of one mind; that is, joined not in opinion, but in heart, and minding one thing, having each the same object in view, the great interests of the soul, and the honour of Christ. Such a spirit would secure them from doing anything "through strife or vain glory," "with murmurings and disputings," and would lead them, agreeably to their Master's spirit, "in lowliness of mind to esteem one another better than themselves," and thus, as, in their circumstances, peculiarly became them, to be "blameless and harmless, the sons of God without rebuke, in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation, among whom they would then shine as lights in the world, holding forth," both in word and behaviour, "the doctrine of eternal life." Virtues were specified corresponding to the relations of such a society, and essential to its prosperity and utility in

* History of the Church, part I.

the world. The same relations and the same duties belong to Christian societies at the present day; a remark which suggests the importance of discriminating between *societies* and *sects*—a view which we would now recommend to particular attention.

The interests of a sect and those of the societies which it comprises, do by no means coincide. Those of the former are comparatively of little importance. The tie which binds together the members of a sect, as such, is a similarity of opinion and taste which they naturally wish, and perhaps unitedly endeavour, to spread in the world; but the members of a society, though a collection of those among whom such a similarity exists, have closer bonds and higher interests, than they who are associated simply on that ground. By a religious society is meant, that "a number of persons of a similar way of thinking, and for no other purpose than merely to enjoy to the greatest advantage their own tastes and opinions in religion, associate to form a congregation." That, as a society, they are to be completely distinguished, in some respects, and those the most important, from the sect or denomination to which they may belong, is clear from the consideration that they would still be a society, bound by all the obligations thereunto pertaining, even supposing that they belonged to no sect, and that there were no other such society in the world. "Religion to them is a personal affair, unconnected with other interests, and their only motive in associating in it at all, is that they find a duty or advantage in social worship, which compels them to adopt means for its performance."

The New Testament, then, let it be repeated, recognises distinct religious societies, not historically only, acknowledging them by name in letters addressed to them or in accounts referring to them, but also by implication, by giving rules applicable only to those who live together in such a connection, holding with each other habitual intercourse, exerting a mutual influence, and having one interest in common, one great end in view. They were "to edify one another," "to have the same care one for another," "to bear each other's burdens," and "to mind the same thing," or contribute, each according to his ability, to the common object for which they became associated; all of which implies specific duties growing out of their connection, and not capable of being exercised toward those living at a distance, with whom they were unconnected or only remotely allied. As members of a Chris-

tian society they had duties as distinct from those which they owed to the universal church, as a man's duties to his own family are from those which he owes to the community at large. Such then is the *distinctive character* of a Christian society, out of which arise, as we have seen, its peculiar *obligations*.

What are the *wants* of such a society? The object of such a society is not to increase the numbers of blind followers of a name or doctrine, but to provide for the wants of those thus associated. The real wants of the society correspond with the most important wants of the individuals which compose it. They are permanent and universal; they are such as are felt by all the members of all sects, and which it is the great design of Christianity to provide for,—the undying wants of the soul; for which the provision of Christianity is applied to the best advantage in proportion as more feel practically the power of the gospel, are interested that others should feel it in like manner, and coöperate in making it felt by an exemplary support and observance of the institutions of the gospel, which were intended to give action to its power, and to exhibit illustration of its value. The support of a society, therefore, is a nobler object than the advancement of the sect to which it belongs. It is worthy of the warmest sympathy, and gives scope to the purest zeal. It is the promotion of man's highest interests, to which indeed the triumphs of a sect may be subservient, but with which the true interests of a society precisely accord. Consequently, one who does not feel a lively interest in the ministrations, or a full acquiescence in the tenets of a society, may consistently give it aid, particularly if he have as yet no decided persuasion on disputed points, or is so situated that he cannot attend worship in the form which he prefers.

The *interests* of a society, as well as its wants, are distinct from those of the sect with which it is connected. Those wants and interests correspond to each other. It is the great interest of a society to have its most important wants supplied. What then are those interests? What would be the leading interests of a religious society if it stood alone in the world; if it were the first or the only religious community founded upon the Christian faith? To have religion preached, felt, and practised, "as entitled to our reverence because it is true, because it provides the most effectual support under the evils of life, and because it affords the most powerful aid to morality." It is for such reasons principally, that we should re-

spect and value it, seek its help, extend its influence, and perpetuate its institutions which, in some form, are common to all sects, and in each are designed to promote personal or practical religion. For our own, our neighbour's, and our children's sake we should appreciate this great concern of society and the soul; for the religious character of our descendants will take a colour from our own, and the Christian prosperity of those who are to come after us will bear a proportion to our exertions.

The interests of a religious society, it has been already observed, are to be distinguished from those of the sect to which it belongs. The sect may be growing while the society is stationary or decreasing; and, on the other hand, a society may be steadfast and flourishing, while the sect with which it is connected is declining. Accordingly that which advances the progress of a sect does not necessarily promote the welfare of a society. You may encourage the publications, the agencies, or the policy of your sect, but this of itself does little or nothing toward the growth of your society. The interest of the latter is not so much to have the numbers increased of those who adopt its opinions, as to have provision made for the wants of its own members. The clergyman is most truly serving the interests of his society, not when he is aiding measures in which all of his sect, all Christians, or all mankind, are concerned, but when he is sowing in the hearts of his customary hearers, the seed which is to be fruitful in the blessings of personal religion to them and theirs.

There is much danger at the present day of confounding together the interests and the prospects of a sect and its societies; interests and prospects in the most important respects distinct, and not to be blended without mischievous consequences. Sects have their periods of commencement, growth, and decline, and their stages of enthusiasm, of reason and examination, and of indifference; but there is no basis for corresponding steps and courses in the constitution of religious societies. The latter have permanent interests, not affected by the storms of controversy or the tides of popular feeling, and may be enlarging their numbers when their respective sects are contracting their bounds, just as domestic ties may be strengthened and multiplied amid the conflicts of party division, or as particular towns may flourish during a period when the government to which they belong has undergone a revolution, or the very soil on which they are built has changed masters. So, on the other hand, a sect may be ex-

panding itself when particular societies attached to it have been shrinking through the indifference or discord of their respective members. The truth may mightily prevail, may fill the land, and unite in faith the majority of mankind, while some society, built upon it, has not been able, from negligence or division, to keep itself in existence. It follows that those who may have become indifferent to speculative distinctions or to party contests, even if they could justify indifference to truth on this ground, cannot thereby excuse themselves from the duty of promoting the prosperity of the societies with which they may be connected. Whether the doctrinal views of a society are right or wrong, their importance overrated or not, their nature understood or vilified, their progress rapid or slow, the wants of the soul remain unaltered, the interests of a religious society unchangeably correspond to them, and unalterable too are the obligations of all its members to love, sustain, and edify one another.

What then is the *policy* of a religious society? Its true policy is to study and apply the means of building itself up in the beauty of Christian holiness. It does not lie in contributing to the progress of the sect in whose bosom it is embraced; although this is a duty, and not to be overlooked. That which advances the religious respectability and prosperity of a society is its true policy. The first requisite, therefore, is for its members to learn to direct their chief efforts to their own welfare, and on their own labours and sacrifices to build their expectations. Societies are prone to take a different view of the subject. They look *abroad* for growth instead of *at home*, to others and not to themselves. The principles of prosperity are within them; and the true secret of strength is not to contrive measures for large accessions on a sudden, but to provide for securing that progressive increase and influence which time promises to patient exertion and established character. But we are apt to build our hopes too much on changes without from sectarian or general efforts, and from that approach to each other which follows the clearer light jointly shed on the field of dispute by the parties in a controversy. We look for the enlargement of our numbers rather from the correctness of our creed, than the attraction of our example, from the fair show which the truth makes in argument, rather than from the more winning manifestations of its practical value. The complaint that more frequent additions are not made to the church, comes from persons who are not themselves just enough to the truth, to confess it before men.

Murmurs about the thinness of the congregation are heard from those who care not themselves enough for the Sabbath and the sanctuary to attend worship, if they can find a cause to detain them at home in some trifling excuse which they have not made too often to be ashamed of. They are loud in proclaiming the dullness of the preacher, which they have done all that indifference could do to increase, and which may be owing in part to his being obliged, through their irregular attendance and its example, so often to address himself to empty seats.

The active interest of individuals in their several societies is not to be governed by the varying fortunes of their sect. It is not to be relaxed when the cause apparently prospers, as if they were sure of advancing with it in the same proportion; nor is it to be discouraged when the cause labours, as if the interests of the society must therefore labour too. The springs of prosperity are in each case distinct, and the prospects in each are different. The true wants of a society, being invariable and perpetual, require the untiring endeavours of its members. Unity of purpose in promoting the great design of the gospel, is a steady principle of action, a principle of stability as well as of growth, by means of which, whether the general interests of a sect be advancing, or retrograde, or stationary, its societies may remain steadfast, and each independent community add at length the advantages of establishments to the improvements adopted in the beginning from the freedom of sects.

Though we have occupied so much space in explaining what has seemed to us to be the distinctive character, the obligations, the wants, the interests, and the policy of Christian societies, we must be permitted to advert, as briefly as possible, to the consequences of indifference and the call for exertion. In all liberal societies at the present day there is a demand for singleness of purpose and unity of effort. No zeal, no eloquence, could preserve or prosper a discordant people. The Apostles laid down no principle more plainly than that the welfare of the church is grounded in love. Liberal societies cannot compete with others formed on stricter principles of church polity, and entertaining different views of Christian influence, either in mere zeal for peculiar doctrines, or in the machinery of popular excitement. They must depend on other means. They must recur to the true principles of social prosperity. Each society must be in earnest to use its own resources for its own benefit to the utmost extent

possible. A new society in a divided community, or one in a minority, may be contented with maintaining its ground, or with advancing slowly. Even this may require a strong, a determined, and unremitting effort, in which all the members should cordially unite. It is a great mistake to think that nothing is wanting but to let things take their own course. The system of protracted meetings is alone enough to show that if liberal societies have sometimes sustained themselves without any extraordinary union of effort, it is not because there is not united zeal and concentrated power which may be inflamed and wielded at will against them. The new force above mentioned will be applied at intervals, until its novelty is worn out, with prodigious effect upon those who come incautiously within the sweep of its current, which in its irresistible progress awes the timid, warps round the worldly and calculating, sucks in the thoughtless and presumptuous, and besides the ignorant and weak, sometimes hurries away the judicious and firm, unawares drawn passively along, and unconscious perhaps of their compulsory movement, and of the cause. If this system should in any case happen to operate unfavourably upon us, we have nothing similar to oppose to it. When this at length shall fail, other machinery will be invented, but *we* shall invent none to counterwork it. *Our* trust must be in applying the principles of true and lasting prosperity. As members of religious societies we must make up by individual disinterestedness and zeal, consistency and usefulness, for the want of fuel for popular heat, and of the weight accumulated by acting uniformly in masses. Our societies, in fine, should cultivate mental and moral independence, a disposition to make truth and right their constant guide, that they may be enabled to follow a conscientious course, and adhere to a wise and steady policy, neither disheartened by disappointments and delays, nor shaken by the apprehension of suffering for the sake of truth and conscience. Their members should coöperate, both by liberality of expenditure, and unity of spirit; each giving for necessary or useful purposes in proportion to his ability, and that proportion in each instance a part of a liberal estimate; each cultivating a spirit of harmony and good will, sustained by a unity of purpose, founded on a conviction of the momentous importance of their common wants, and the coincidence of their real interests, on their common obligations to God and to each other, to the present and the coming generations.

A Christian minister has indeed a weighty responsibility,

but so likewise has a Christian people. A society acting upon such principles as have now been urged, might hope to prosper, if the Apostles understood what Christian prosperity is; acting contrary to them, it must inevitably decline and cease to be fruitful, though it should have yearly a new Paul to plant, and a new Apollos to water.

Although in some points of view the interests of a society and a sect are separate (without being opposite,) and those of the former far outweigh in importance those of the latter, yet they act reciprocally upon each other; and although a single society may go to decay while the sect to which it belongs continues to grow, yet it is plain that no sect could be flourishing while all its societies were falling away; consequently, notwithstanding the distinction that we have kept in sight between them, we may draw the conclusion, that to advance the prosperity of its Societies is the policy of a Sect.

T. R. Sullivan.

The Unitarian Heresy.

We cannot say when, or by whom the practice was first introduced into the world, of so abusing the Scripture term "heresy," as to make it mean "an unsound system of belief,"—and of so misapplying the Scripture term "heretic," as to make it denote "one who holds an erroneous opinion." It is quite certain that such definitions are not to be found in the Apostolic Dictionary. The man must have been himself a heretic, in the true sense, that sense which we shall presently unfold, who first perverted so strangely the language of the Bible.

These and other similar reflections were suggested to us when we were reading sometime since a passage from a distinguished transatlantic writer, in which he is pleased to designate Unitarianism as a "puny heresy." If the author meant to say merely that the Unitarians constitute but a "small sect," he was right, comparatively speaking, in regard to the fact—and used in a proper sense the term heresy. But the whole strain of the writer's remarks in the context forbids us to interpret him so favourably. All that he says about the "meagre phantom," the "pitiful shadow," the "spectre," forces us to believe that the thinness of the Uni-

tarian ranks constituted in his mind a grand argument against the Unitarian system. If he had not regarded it as a *puny* heresy, he would not have called it a heresy *at all*. But we would ask if there may not be a gigantic heresy as well as a dwarfish heresy? We think, in the true apostolic sense, there may be. It seems to us that the author's *implied* argument (no man of note would venture to express it openly), that because Unitarianism is the system of comparatively few, therefore it is a heresy in the invidious sense,—it seems to us that this argument is like the reasoning of the child, that a copper cent is worth more than a silver sixpence because it is bigger. Is this the way in which men are to judge of the comparative value and truth of systems!

But this author is not alone in the view in which we quote him. From the earliest times the system of the *majority* has generally been looked up to and *looked down from* as orthodoxy, and every deviation from it as so much heresy. At its birth men called Unitarianism heresy, in order if possible to frighten it to death. As it grew up to childhood and youth they still repeated the cry in order to warn the world against its power.

We have not of late heard Unitarianism *called* heresy, but there are still many who regard and dread it as such; and we have thought it might be useful, for the sake of Unitarians as well as of others, to inquire what heresy really is,—what the Apostles considered it,—who are heretics,—and how we may know whether the charge of heresy is or is not applicable to ourselves.

When it is said, then, that Unitarianism is a heresy—what is meant? A reproach? Paul did not think to condemn himself when, on his defence before Agrippa, he professed to have adhered faithfully to the strictest sect (literally heresy) of his religion. The word cannot be applied *invidiously* on the authority of Paul. The utmost that can be made of the charge, on the strength of his language, is that the Unitarians constitute a sect. And so do the Trinitarians constitute a sect. No harm then, surely, can be intended by calling any body of men whatever a *heresy* in the proper sense of language.

But is it meant that the *system of opinions and principles* on which the heresy or sect is built constitutes the members of the sect heretical and that thus the Unitarians are heretics, and accordingly must be classed among those whom Paul in the tenth verse of his third chapter to Titus directs him to

admonish and, if incorrigible, to reject? It seems to us that this conclusion also is authorized neither by the language of the Apostles, nor by what we know of the practice of the church in the apostolic age. Read the verse following the one already referred to. "Knowing that he that is such (a heretic) is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself." Does this sound like the description of one whose only fault is an error in opinion? Does it not apply more exactly to one who has violated in some way the *spirit* of Christianity? We think so and shall presently define the word "heretic" accordingly. But we said also, that the view we are opposing could not be justified by an appeal to the practice of the apostolic churches. On this subject indeed little has been handed down to us on which we can rely,—but we know nothing to make it improbable, and much to make it probable that there were, even then, differences of opinion on secondary matters—minor modifications of doctrine—yet all held and tolerated in "one spirit"—and that, the very opposite of the spirit of heresy.

When we say "the *spirit* of heresy," we anticipate the view we are next to present of the Apostle's meaning,—a view not new, nor peculiar to ourselves, but one, nevertheless, which we consider important to be kept in mind and in heart by Unitarians and by every denomination of Christians. We understand, then, Paul to mean by "heretic" a man of heretical disposition (not merely of wrong *opinions*),—a man in whom is the *spirit* of heresy,—the spirit of *sect*. Wakefield, we think, defines the word rightly, "a fomenter of divisions." It has nothing to do with the truth or falsity of any doctrine, but only with the spirit in which that doctrine is held or urged. Milton says "a man may be a heretic in the truth; and if he believe things only because his pastor says so, or the assembly so determines, without knowing other reason, though his belief be true, yet the very truth he holds becomes his heresy." Now, though we think there are other more natural manifestations of the spirit of heresy than those to which Milton alludes, some of which we shall directly notice, yet we agree with him most fully in the principle that the quality denoted by the word *heretical* is a quality of *disposition* and not of *doctrine*. What then, let us ask, are some of the elements of the spirit of heresy,—and what some of the prominent modes of its manifestation?

In the first place, then, the spirit of heresy is a proud spirit. In all ages of the world sectaries who agreed, perhaps, after

all, in doctrines of essential importance, have persecuted each other for differences in the manner of looking at those doctrines. Was the relation of God to Christ the subject? Men who agreed that Christ was a moral manifestation of the Deity have pronounced each other heretics because they could not agree upon the question *how* the manifestation was made. Each has been too proud to meet the other on the common ground,—and therefore they have either haughtily stood apart each on his own little spot, or they have battled each for the peculiar spot of the other. Was the relation of Jesus Christ to mankind the subject? Men who agreed in the great truth that Christ died for us, and who might have agreed in gratitude for his love, have yet chosen to persecute each other as heretics, because, according to one party, Christ paid literally a price for us, and, according to the other, he saved us by means of a religion which he died to establish. Is this the evidence of Christian humility,—of that gratitude which becomes finite beings who have received an infinite favour? Does it not rather betoken a selfish, spiritual pride, of the same nature with that temporal pride which makes a man think more of the small distinctions of rank or fortune than of those great blessings which he enjoys in common with others? Is not then the spirit of heresy, which makes men value more their peculiar modifications of doctrine than the great doctrine itself which they hold in common with others,—is not such a spirit the opposite of Christian humility?

Again, the spirit of heresy is a spirit of opposition,—of contradiction,—of dissension,—of denial. The thorough heretic lives upon opposition. His element is dissension. Imagine a perfect heretic, that is, one who is perfectly imbued with the spirit of heresy, and you have an idea of the embodied principle of evil. Goëthe, in his Faust, well calls the spirits of darkness, the *denying* spirits. We need not add that the spirit of heresy is a factious—a party spirit.

If such, then, be the spirit of heresy it is no light thing to call any man or any body of men heretical. Do the Unitarians deserve the reproach? We have seen, we must confess, the case of a church, recently separated from the Orthodox body, in which the animating principle seemed to partake too much of the spirit of opposition, of heresy,—but we have seen other churches pursuing, though a positive, yet a peaceful course. Certainly the Unitarian system is not a system of negations, whatever may be said of the spirit in which its principles have been sometimes held and urged. Unitarian-

ism embraces the great truths of the gospel. But, whether it be the truth or not is of little consequence compared with another question, and that is, are Unitarians actuated by the spirit of truth. This is something for which all of us, of whatever sect or name, ought to strive and pray more earnestly and fervently than for even truth itself. A man may not know when he has the true *doctrine*, but he may know whether he have the *spirit* of truth or the spirit of heresy.

Unitarians, especially, ought to think of this,—their system is considered heresy. Let them not justify the charge by holding their faith in a mere spirit of opposition. Let them not imagine that, because true, it will necessarily triumph. The spirit of heresy can only be weakness, and even truth maintained in such a spirit may be worse than weak. "If any man have not the spirit of Christ he is none of his." But what is the spirit of Christ? It is that spirit which in his last solemn farewell to his disciples, our Saviour promised to give them,—that spirit which he said the world could not receive,—the spirit of truth. Here lies, after all, the strength of Unitarianism,—the strength of the church. The genius of heresy has reigned long enough in Christendom. It has done more harm to the cause of our religion than the open attacks of outward foes. The public history of Christianity seems like a history of rival heresies. Some are accustomed to look upon the smaller sects as the heretics. We see as much of the heretical spirit in one party as in another, in the majority as in the minority,—only it manifests itself differently in the two. In the larger party it is usually spiritual tyranny,—in the smaller, spiritual rebellion. It is time such a spirit should give way to the spirit of truth, which casteth out the spirit of heresy. It is time men should study and labour not merely *against error*, but for truth. If Unitarians would refute the charge of heresy, let them silently show forth the truth they believe in their lives and characters. There lies the only true test of the heretic or the Christian.

We trust that the Unitarians are becoming more and more a *positive* sect. We do not say that we hope *Unitarianism* is becoming more and more a positive *system*, because we believe it has always held to the grand facts of the Bible. But we do wish to see Unitarian *men* every day becoming more and more possessed with the positive progressive spirit of truth. We wish to see them in the true catholic spirit, taking their stand upon the grand central truths of the Bible,—striving to establish in themselves and others the ground-principles

of Christianity, and to breathe the spirit of the truth as it is in Jesus,—and thus doing their part towards ejecting that demon of heresy which has so long tyrannized over heavenly truth. C. T. Brooks.

Letters to Unbelievers.

No. V.

RELIGIOUS BELIEF OF BENJAMIN FRANKLIN.

Fellow Citizens,

Your attention is now invited to an examination of the religious opinions of Benjamin Franklin. You claim him as an unbeliever. I have examined all his published writings, and discover that your claims are altogether unfounded. The evidence in support of this assertion I shall present in his own words. I shall quote from his life which he wrote in his old age and left unfinished; and also from his private letters and public documents.

I suppose that all who have read the life of Franklin know that he was a deist in the former part of his life. He afterwards embraced Christianity and died a Christian. After I have shown you from his own words, that he embraced the gospel, and endeavoured to conform to its precepts, I will show you how he became a deist in early life, and what influence infidelity had on him, and how he condemned it as injurious.

The Rev. Dr. Stiles, President of Yale College, wrote a letter to Dr. Franklin in the last years of his life. He requested to know Franklin's views of religion. I will give you a short extract from his truly liberal letter. These are the words of Dr. Stiles.

"You know, sir, that I am a Christian, and would to heaven that all others were such as I am, except my imperfections and deficiencies of moral character. As much as I know of Dr. Franklin, I have not an idea of his religious sentiments. I wish to know the opinion of my venerable friend concerning Jesus of Nazareth. He will not impute this to *impertinence*, or improper curiosity, in one, who for so many years has continued to love, estimate, and reverence his abilities and literary character, with an ardour and affection bordering on adoration. If I have said too much let the request be blotted out, and be no more; and

yet I shall never cease to wish you that happy immortality, which I believe Jesus alone has purchased for the virtuous and truly good of every religious denomination in Christendom, and for those of every age, nation, and mythology, who reverence the Deity, are filled with integrity, righteousness, and benevolence." —*Works*, Vol. VI. p. 240.

This is a plain question. Do you think Franklin will give an explicit answer, with his usual honesty and frankness? Or do you suppose he will evade it, either partially or wholly? Listen to his reply.

"You desire to know something of my religion. It is the first time I have been questioned upon it. But I cannot take your curiosity amiss, and shall endeavour in a few words to gratify it. Here is my creed. I believe in one God, the Creator of the universe. That he governs it by his Providence. That he ought to be worshipped. That the most acceptable service we can render to him is doing good to his other children. That the soul of man is immortal, and will be treated with justice in another life respecting its conduct in this. These I take to be the fundamental points in all sound religion, and I regard them as you do in whatever sect I meet with them. As to Jesus of Nazareth, my opinion of whom you particularly desire, I thing the system of morals and his religion, as he left them to us, the best the world ever saw or is likely to see; but I apprehend it has received various corrupting changes, and I have, with most of the present dissenters in England, some doubts as to his divinity; though it is a question I do not dogmatize upon, having never studied it, and think it needless to busy myself with it now, when I expect soon an opportunity of knowing the truth with less trouble."—*Works*, Vol. VI. pp. 241, 242.

I should think this statement would be sufficiently definite to satisfy the most skeptical inquirer. Franklin expressed his firm belief in Christianity in a letter to an orthodox minister. He rejected the additions and corruptions of this holy religion which had been embodied in human creeds and fallible systems of divinity. He doubted the divinity of Christ like the Unitarians with whom he had associated in England. Were I called upon to state the leading articles of my Christian faith, I should be willing to adopt the same language with one single exception. Instead of expressing doubts respecting the divinity of Jesus, I should affirm that I had studied the question, and rejected the Orthodox notion on this subject altogether. I believe in the divinity of his mission and of his doctrines but

not in the divinity of his person. These views of religion were believed and practised for many years, as I will now show from his writings.

Franklin stated in the last quotation that God ought to be worshipped. I will now present you his views respecting prayer. My first extract is from a letter to his sister. These are his words.

"You express yourself as if you thought I was against worshipping God. I am so far from thinking that God is not to be worshipped, that I have composed and wrote a whole book of devotions for my own use."—*Works*, Vol. VI. p. 5.

I will give one specimen from those parts of his devotions which are still preserved. The following may serve as an example.

"Inasmuch as by reason of our ignorance we cannot be certain that many things which we often hear mentioned in the petitions of men to the Deity, would prove real goods if they were in our possession, and as I have reason to hope and believe that the goodness of my *heavenly Father* will not withhold from me a suitable share of temporal blessings, if by a *virtuous* and *holy* life I conciliate his favor and kindness; therefore I presume not to ask such things, but rather humbly and with a sincere heart express my earnest desire that he would graciously assist my continual endeavours and resolutions of eschewing vice and embracing virtue; which kind of supplication will at the same time remind me in a solemn manner of my extensive duty."

"That I may be preserved from Atheism, impiety, and profaneness; and in my addresses to Thee carefully avoid irreverence and ostentation, formality and odious hypocrisy, help me, O Father."

"That I may refrain from calumny and detraction; that I may may abhor and avoid deceit and envy, fraud, flattery, and hatred, malice, lying and ingratitude, help me, O Father.

"That I may be sincere in friendship, faithful in trust, and impartial in judgment, watchful against pride and anger, help me, O Father."

"That I may be just in all my dealings, temperate in my pleasures, full of candour and ingenuousness, humanity and benevolence, help me, O Father."

"That I may be grateful to my benefactors, and generous to my friends, exercising charity and liberality to the poor, and piety to the miserable, help me, O Father."

"That I may possess integrity and evenness of mind, resolution in difficulties, and fortitude under affliction; that I may be punctual in performing my promises, peaceable and prudent in my behaviour, help me, O Father."

"That I may have tenderness for the weak, and reverent respect for the ancient; that I may be kind to my neighbours, good natured to my companions, and hospitable to strangers, help me, O Father."

"That I may be averse to craft and overreaching, abhor extortion, perjury, and every kind of wickedness, help me, O Father."

"That I may be honest and open-hearted, gentle merciful, and good, cheerful in spirit, rejoicing in the good of others, help me, O Father."

"That I may have a constant regard to honor and probity, that I may possess a perfect innocence and a good conscience, and at length become truly virtuous and magnanimous, help me good God, help me, O Father. And forasmuch as ingratitude is one of the most odious vices, let me not be unmindful gratefully to acknowledge the favours I receive from heaven."—*Works*, Vol. V. pp. 8–10. English edition.

Dr. Franklin not only practised daily secret devotion, but he was in favor of public prayer. The following speech in the Convention for the adoption of the Constitution of the United States will confirm my statement.

"Mr. President,

"The small progress we have made after four or five weeks close attendance and continual reasonings with each other, our different sentiments on almost every question, several of the last producing as many noes as ayes, is methinks a melancholy proof of the imperfection of the human understanding. We indeed seem to *feel* our want of political wisdom, since we have been running all about in search of it. We have gone back to ancient history for models of government, and examined the different forms of those republics, which, having been originally formed with the seeds of their own dissolution, now no longer exist; and we have viewed modern states all around Europe, but find none of their constitutions suitable to our circumstances. In this situation of this assembly, groping as it were in the dark, to find political truth, and scarce able to distinguish it when presented to us, how has it appened, Sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of Lights to illuminate our understandings? In the beginning of the contest with Britain, when we were sensible of danger, we had daily prayers in this room for the Divine direction. Our prayers, Sir, were heard; and they were graciously answered. All of us who were engaged in the struggle, must have observed frequent instances of a superintending Providence in our favour. To that kind Providence we owe this happy opportunity of consulting in peace on the means of establishing our future national felicity. And have we now forgotten that powerful Friend?

Or do we imagine we no longer need His assistance? I have lived, Sir, a long time; and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth. *That God governs in the affairs of men.* And if a sparrow connot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid? We have been assured, Sir, in the sacred writings, that except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it. I firmly believe this; and I also believe that with out His concurring aid, we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel. We shall be divided by our little partial, local interests; our projects will be confounded, and we ourselves shall become a reproach and a byeword down to future ages. And what is worse, mankind may hereafter, from this unfortunate instance, despair of establishing government by human wisdom, and leave it to chance, war, and conquest. I beg leave to move that henceforth prayers, imploring the assistance of Heaven and its blessings on our deliberations, be held in this assembly every morning before we proceed to business; and that one or more of the clergy of this city be requested to officiate in that service."—*Life and Works*, first English edition, Vol. I. p. 389.

These are noble sentiments. They are worthy of the distinguished statesman and philosopher by whom they were uttered. They do honour to his head and his heart. They serve to stamp the name of Christian upon his character. Spoken in such a manner, at such an age, before such an assembly, they entitle him to the respect of all the followers of Jesus. And when the skepticism and fanaticism of the present period shall have passed, this speech will be regarded as one of the brightest gems in his crown of earthly glory. Observe too how far removed are the sentiments of this speech from those expressed by modern unbelievers! As far removed as light is from darkness.

Dr. Franklin entertained rational views respecting the Scriptures. The following extract from a letter to a Unitarian friend will furnish you with his opinions respecting the Old Testament.

"Understanding that my letter intended for you was lost, I take this opportunity to give you the purport of it as well as I can recollect. I agreed with you in sentiments respecting the Old Testament; and thought the clause in our constitutions, which required the members of assembly to declare their belief, that the *whole* of it was given by divine inspiration, had better have been omitted. That I had opposed the clause; but being overpowered by numbers, and fearing more might in future

times be grafted on it, I prevailed to have the additional clause, that no further or more extended profession of faith should ever be exacted. So much for that letter, to which I may now add, that there are several things in the Old Testament, impossible to be given by *divine* inspiration; such as the approbation ascribed to the angel of the Lord, of that abominably wicked and detestable action of Jael, the wife of Heber, the Kenite. If the rest of the book were like that, I should rather suppose it given by inspiration from another quarter, and renounce the whole." —*Works*, Vol. VI. p. 155.

These remarks manifest that discrimination which ought ever to be made respecting the Hebrew Scriptures. The cause of religion has been greatly injured by the writings of unwise believers. They have asserted most roundly that the whole of the Old Testament was given by divine inspiration. They could not produce a particle of satisfactory proof in support of their position, while there existed an abundance of internal evidence to the contrary. Such high claims for these ancient writings have induced superficial reasoners to reject the whole as fictitious stories. Franklin had too much candour and judgment to pursue so credulous a course. His notions were correct as some further extracts will fully discover. The following passages may serve as a specimen.

"A zealous advocate for the proposed federal constitution in a public assembly said, that the repugnance of a great part of mankind to good government was such, that he believed, that if an angel from heaven was to bring down a constitution, formed there for our use, it would nevertheless meet with violent opposition. He was reproved for the supposed extravagance of the sentiment, and he did not justify it. Probably it might not have immediately occurred to him, that the experiment had been tried, and that the event was recorded in the *most faithful of all histories, the Holy Bible*; otherwise he might, as it seems to me, have supported his opinion by that *unexceptionable authority*."

"It appears that the Israelites were a people jealous of their newly acquired liberty, which jealousy was in itself no fault; but that, when they suffered it to be worked upon by artful men, pretending public good, with nothing really in view but private interest, they were led to oppose the establishment of the new constitution, whereby they brought upon themselves much inconvenience and misfortune. It further appears, from the same *inestimable history*, that when, after many ages, the constitution had become old and much abused, and an amendment of it was proposed, the populace, as they had accused Moses of the ambition of making himself a prince, and cried out, stone him! stone

him! so excited by their high priests and scribes, they exclaimed against the Messiah, that he aimed at becoming king of the Jews, and cried, crucify him! crucify him!"—*Works*, Vol. V. pp. 428. 431. B. WHITMAN.

[To be concluded in our next.]

Considerations for Philosophical Rejecters of the Christian Faith.

PERHAPS no assertion is more commonly set forth by the organs of infidelity than that the Christian religion cannot bear the test of close intellectual examination. It is continually said that when the eye of *reason* is fixed upon its character and claims, all its disguises are pierced, all its falsity is exposed, and all the arguments by which it has been supported, stand out in the shameful nakedness of detected imposture. It is affirmed that clouded intellects alone can fail to perceive the broad fallacies that spoil its proofs, and weak minds alone consent to serve its cause. For the purpose perhaps of covering this last position, it is sometimes even pretended that when respectable intellects do enlist themselves in its service, they most grossly and knowingly impose on the common mind, and basely promote their own selfish interests by tributes extorted from the superstitious agonies and fears of their fellow-men.

In reply to such statements,—statements which excite our deepest amazement when they first come to our knowledge,—we need only point to the CHRISTIAN MIND, such as it has been and is, and such as it surely will continue to be so long as the *human* mind shall exist. Milton, and Newton, and Locke, when charged with hypocrisy, need no defence. It is needless to attempt the proof of anything so notoriously true as that Christianity has been welcomed as a visitant from heaven by the greatest minds to which her claims have been addressed. It is also true that, wherever her character has been understood, she has exercised her salutary control over the wide extent of the common mind. And we would have the philosophical unbeliever observe that a two-fold argument results hence in favour of our religion. It is no small argument in support of Christianity that her claims have been tested and admitted by those minds which have occupied the very

highest rank, while no mind of the *first* order has ever opposed those claims. To our own mind this argument has great force, and the more it is dwelt upon the more powerful does it appear. Still, it is not often insisted upon, and Christianity, in the multitude of her almost innumerable proofs, can well dispense with it. Yet Christianity is welcomed also by the common mind,—by weak minds, if the unbeliever will so express it. Thus Christianity, in this two-fold confirmation of its truth, is shown to be suited to the soul of man, to the universal mind. The highest intellect acknowledges its truth, the humblest soul feels its power. The *principles of human nature* thus offer their testimony that Christianity is from God. And why is this homage paid? Not only because the facts of our religion are historically true, and thus Christ is proved to have been a teacher come from God by the experience of the world,—*experience*, that idol to which infidel reasoners have so long paid homage,—but because Christianity has presented to the soul those *spiritual realities* upon which it can place its dependence, as the body rests itself upon the solid ground of this material globe. We place upon Jesus of Nazareth our faith and hope, not only because he did wondrous works, which no man could do unless God were with him, but because he appears to us as the Sun of Righteousness, revealing to the view of our minds the objects of the celestial world, just as the light of the sun in the heavens discloses mountain, river, and ocean to the organ of vision.

While the proof that Christianity is from heaven is thus embodied in facts that have happened on the earth, while the highest and purest reason assents to its claim, and the heart of man puts forth its eloquent appeal in its behalf, we may be surprised to hear of its being rejected after a philosophical examination. It is our object to explain how this happens. We do not in fact think it surprising. A little reflection will show how easily Christianity may be rejected, by him who *wishes* to reject it, after a plausible *show* of right reasoning and philosophy. We mean to say, and we shall attempt to show, that in the examination of Christianity there is room for the *dishonesty* of argument and philosophy. We can very well conceive of the mind that would be prepared to make those statements with which we commenced, relating to the intellectual character of the advocates of Christian truth. And we wish to describe, in various particulars, the dishonesty of such a mind, after we have first stated in general terms the opportunity there is found in the character of Christianity for

its dishonest action. Our two objects then are these. 1. We wish to bring into view that character of Christianity by which, though its evidences are so exceedingly numerous and weighty, it furnishes ample scope for the manifestation of honest or dishonest purpose in the examination of its claims. 2. We wish to speak in more particular terms of the various occasions presented in the course of this examination for the exercise of such a purpose, and of the manner in which the evidences for the Christian faith, though altogether conclusive to an honest mind, still leaves the *will* uncompelled. We wish to premise a single remark under each of these heads, and will then proceed at once to the separate development of each.

In respect to the first head we would say that this feature of Christianity, of which we design to speak, harmonizes perfectly with all the other traits of the moral administration under which we live, in bearing testimony to the wisdom of God, and to the view which, in all his arrangements, he has to human volition and human virtue. In relation to the second head, we would make the obvious, though necessary remark, that in pointing out instances of dishonesty, we suppose Christianity not merely to have been heard of, but to have been seen and fairly presented to the mind.

1. We presume that all will agree with us in the statement that conscience has her part to perform in the direction of the mind, just as truly as in the direction of the life. In fact, so far as the character of a man's life depends upon his choice, it is the result either of those direct efforts of the will which produce external actions, or of those qualities of mind which the will has had an influence in producing. So far as a man's life does not either directly or indirectly flow from the free decisions of the will, so far, his life has the attribute of perfect innocence possessing no moral character. In strictness of speech, then, obedience and disobedience lie entirely within the mind,—and what we call *acts* of guilt are but the consequences of preceding acts of the will, in which all the guilt consists. Now it cannot be doubted that the movements of the will are continually exerting a control over the intellectual powers, in the discipline to which they are subjected, guiding them in the path which they pursue, and influencing them in a degree more or less marked, in all the service they perform in the formation of opinions and the acquisition of truth. We are very apt to talk of a man's faith or want of faith, as being entirely out of his own control, of his having his opinions imposed upon him by laws of the intellectual

nature whose operation he cannot resist. And the great reason why very many regard persecution for opinion's sake as a horrible thing, is found in their belief that opinion is in its nature involuntary. They regard those who are persecuted for their belief, much in the same light that they would those who should become the objects of reproach for having a peculiar bodily formation. But this persecution of the mind is to be condemned, not because it censures a belief which is unalterable, but because it prevents that *liberty* of belief which would otherwise exist; because it separates a man's conscience from his faith, and of course from his life; binds opinions upon him which he has not chosen, and thus, in its deadly grasp, crushes the moral nature. Persecution is horrible, because it hinders conscience in the free exercise of those most important functions which she has to perform in the hidden chambers of the mind. We do not mean to say that a man chooses his faith from the vast collection of human opinions, just as he selects an article of merchandise in a warehouse. But we do mean to say, that honest or dishonest purpose exerts a constant, though silent pressure, in shaping the course which the mind takes in the investigation of truth, and, by necessary consequence, in determining at what results it shall arrive. The student as he gropes his way may see a glimmer of heavenly truth, and yet turn away from it as the forest robber flies from the light of a human habitation. We may shut our eyes in mid-day, and pretend and even persuade *ourselves* that we are encompassed with darkness.

These remarks will apply to the study of any subject, but, as we are speaking of Christianity, we shall now make some remarks to show that, in the investigation of the claims of religion, there is room for the free action of the will.

The *term* Christianity is one which, in its ordinary use, covers a subject of so vast extent and various character, that, in considering the question, whether Christianity, as a *system of divine truth*, is worthy of credit, there is the greatest opportunity for the free action of the will,—and, consequently, for honest or dishonest purpose. The claims of Christianity no more force themselves, as philosophically just, upon the understanding than they force themselves upon the heart as worthy the welcome of its best affections.

For, when we speak of Christianity as an institution, how broad the field of topics embraced in the appellation. The imagination instinctively glances at the condition of the world

eighteen centuries ago, and traces its history along from that period to the present,—we think of all the successive and changing aspects of the human mind and human character, which have been shown up as this "long train of ages" has been gliding away, and of the action and influence of that new element,—the Christian Faith,—which during the whole time has been working with such energy in the human mind and character;—we see drawn out in long array before us the immense multitude of human establishments which Christianity has moulded into forms better suited to her own divine principles, and which she has borne along in the direction of her own deep current;—we are reminded of that long list of great, immortal names which have been written upon her covenants, —the names of those who have drunk deeply of her living water, and gazed reverently up at her glorious revelations;—we picture to ourselves the various fortune which she has received in the bosom of the church, and from the assaults of external adversaries;—we look around upon the earth, and we connect her blessed influence with everything great and noble that the eye can see, and her tender compassion and watchful anxiety with everything base and unworthy that has thus far resisted her kindness;—and we look forward into the future to the time, when she shall have transfused her spirit through all human institutions and all human hearts, when "they shall not hurt or destroy in all my holy mountain; for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea." Such a fullness of meaning has the word *Christianity*. Our religion can hardly be defined as consisting in a series of facts and a system of abstract doctrines. The facts and doctrines contained in the Christian Scriptures are so bound in with their influence and history,—religion, as a collection of abstract doctrines and truths, is so inseparably associated with religion as an *operative* thing, that, in common speech, we are obliged to consider these two correlative parts as joining to make up one entire whole.

Such is the multitude of topics comprised in the definition of Christianity. And the bearing which all these topics have on the revelation by Jesus is regarded by the true Christian with a kindling eye and a swelling soul. Not so with him who wishes to disbelieve. The vast field which Christianity occupies increases those opportunities for attack which he desires to improve. So much is to be examined that almost numberless temptations to unjust criticism are presented to him who would deal falsely with his understanding. The mind is

to be applied to so many points that dishonest purpose will often find the means to give it a false guidance. It has so often to be enlightened that, if there be a purpose to that end, it may every day be blinded. Attention may in some sense be regarded as the eye of the mind. It is that through which the mind apprehends or perceives the truth. Now who doubts the great power possessed over the attention by the will? Who does not feel that he has a power to exclude one truth from his thoughts and to bring another within the range of his mind, similar to the power he has to select any object from the material universe for the continued inspection of the eye. The power in the former case is more indirect, but not less real, than in the latter, and, different from that in the latter, is exerted not so much with reference to single points, as with reference to classes of objects. The will cannot select a particular thought for the contemplation of the intellect;—this implies the previous existence in the mind of the thought itself,—but it *can* select a *general* range of ideas for intellectual study. Who has not seen the power which in the advocate the will exerts to confine his mind to one view of a subject, to one range of argument? Now, by the power of habitual dishonesty in the will every one in the examination of Christian truth may lose the pure undistorted vision of candid simplicity, and act the part of the advocate in settling the claims of that truth on which his best hopes depend. In seeking salvation he may perpetually argue the cause of a selfish and perverted heart. If, in the very face of Christ's plainest miracles, the power of dishonest intention was such that the Jews could say "he casteth out devils by Beelzebub, the prince of the devils;"—the same power, skilfully trained and practised, may give one the hardihood to say, what the Jews could not say unless they should deny the evidence of the senses, that the miracles were not performed at all. We shall now go on to describe in several particulars, the influence exerted by a dishonest will in the examination of the evidences of Christianity.

1. The dishonesty of the philosophical unbeliever may appear in his taking an extremely partial view of the character of Christianity. Our faith is a completely harmonious whole. The admirable consistency of its separate parts gives strong presumption of its entire truth. Besides no part can be rightly understood or rightly judged, even in its intrinsic character, without a just view of its various connections. One part is strengthened by another, the questions suggested by one part

are resolved by another, and the difficulties vanish from every part the moment a comprehensive view is taken of the whole. Christianity may be termed an *arch-work* of truth, and he who forcibly rends a portion of Christian doctrine away from its connections and supports, introduces it among the articles of his own earthly creed, and then condemns it because inconsistent with that, in addition to his dishonesty, shows a folly like that of supposing that, because no weight can crush an arch, therefore any portion of that arch will, by itself, be equally stable. This violent sundering of the parts of Christianity, and then sneeringly asking for the evidence of its utility or truth, is like doubting about the value of a steam-engine, because, forsooth, we will look upon it as if it had no piston to communicate power to the various parts. We know that this partial judgment is a marked trait of vulgar minds when they make their decisions in the contests of individuals or the shocks of systems. One shout of triumph on account of supposed victory, though it relate to the most insignificant part of a controversy, with such minds decides the whole matter. The slightest embarrassment in a witness may lead them to condemn his whole testimony with the charge of a perjured conscience. That one who pretends to subject Christianity to a philosophical examination, should pursue the course into which others fall from narrowness or ignorance of mind, leaves a strong presumption against his character for honest dealing in the concerns of truth.

We will close our remarks under this point by an illustration of them drawn from the manner in which an infidel writer treats the subject of miracles. The reasoning proceeds thus. "Christianity pretends to be attested by miracles. Miracles are impossible,—therefore Christianity is false." The proofs establishing the fact that miracles were actually wrought are winked out of sight. The testimony borne to their actual occurrence in a history which cannot be contradicted, is treated as if it did not exist. The sublime character of the person to whom these miracles are ascribed, elevated as it was above every subterfuge and meanness, and as open to inspection as the face of heaven, is thought worthy of entire neglect. The state of the world, the dreadful degradation of man's religious nature, the pressing necessity there was that a voice from heaven should raise the human soul from its downward tendencies to a better faith and hope, are completely set aside. The actual and undeniable existence of religious principles in the mind, the vain strugglings of these principles to reach, by

their own efforts, a pure and worthy faith, the impossibility of establishing a religion on the direct authority of God,—such a religion as the whole world was crying out for,—without manifestations of the *power* of God,—all these things our philosophical rejecter of the religion of Jesus, deems worthy of not a moment's consideration. He says, miracles are impossible,—a statement just equivalent to a man's calling his own existence an impossibility, and denying that the earth on which he treads can be a real thing. If the miracle of the universe was possible, equally possible was the raising of Lazarus from the dead. But both these things required that the same Almighty hand should move. Any man who admits an eternal Existence and Power, must admit that miracles may be performed on any fit occasion. He who denies this eternal Existence and Power, cannot possibly preserve his consistency without denying *all* existence and all power.

The infidel says it is impossible to comprehend an Almighty Being. We reply that it is *necessary* to conceive of and admit his existence, and we ask him which is easier, to believe in the eternity of a Supreme Being, or to believe that nothing exists, not even the mind that believes or disbelieves.

We would, then, inquire of the philosophical infidel whether he has treated Christianity with the *mind* of a philosopher, whether he has looked at Christianity in its whole broad and glorious character, or whether, with a dishonest will, he has taken but partial glances, and grasped at specious objections, and turned away the eye of his mind from the light of the truth? He seems to think that if he proposes a single plausible objection against some comparatively unimportant feature of Christianity when he has torn it away from its living connections and dependencies, the whole system receives its death-blow at his hand. And what renders this course of proceeding the more unfair, he takes for Christianity anything that has ever assumed its name,—and because some human addition to the oracles of truth seems to him unworthy of God, therefore, in his view, God has never spoken to the world. Thus, if he possess anything like enlargement of mind and has proceeded with deliberate intention, he has been guilty of two intellectual crimes. They are crimes against himself, and therefore not noticed by human law,—but they are crimes against the soul,—the soul which bears in itself the testimony that it is God's noblest work, and to whose perfection all the movements of his creative energy conspire. We would beseech the infidel to come to the Oracles of Truth with his

mind and his heart open, and gaze at all their glorious revelations in their own full harmony and perfect proportion, and we assure him that then he will soon feel his soul swelling with the consciousness of its immortality, and that he will experience a sublimity of spiritual elevation that will make him look down with scorn upon his former faith in the life of his body as the only life of his soul.

Other points may be considered at a future time.

C. A. B.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Forgiveness of Sin. A Practical Exposition on Psalm CXXX. *By* JOHN OWEN, D. D. *Abridged by* EBENEZER PORTER, D. D. Boston, William Pierce. 1834.

THE compiler of this work of the former Vice Chancellor of the University of Oxford remarks in his Preface, that "it is much to be lamented that the writings of Owen, distinguished as they are by strength of original thought and depth of pious feeling, should be substantially lost to the present and all coming generations, by the pleonastic phraseology with which they are encumbered." He professes to give the sentiments of Owen in the words of Owen, "excepting that the process of blotting has often left a *part* of his words to represent the whole; and, in a small proportion of sentences, the change of a word or two has been deemed indispensable."

The idea the compiler seems to have of Dr. Owen's writings is this,—that they are distinguished for depth and originality of thought, yet rendered obscure and diffuse by what he calls an "endless multiplication of tautologies, aud epithets, and adjuncts."

We agree with the compiler that a strain of pious feeling runs through this book which may render it useful. Wherever we see anything of the spirit of the Christian faith, though this spirit be blended with some doctrines that we deem erroneous, and though its manifestation be not connected with much of intellectual power, we feel it our duty to speak, in the first place, of the exhibition of that spirit in words of commendation. But we

confess we cannot see in this production much evidence of strong thought. The preface speaks of the great diffuseness of the original work. Diffuse indeed it must be, for we never should have supposed the work under our hands to be an *abridgment*. And this diffuseness, alone, furnishes a presumption that the work is not marked by strong thought. If the thought be forceful, so will the manner and the style. The manner of the mind's manifestation seems a part of the mind itself. If one reads a book whose value he is capable of appreciating, and if he does not have in himself the sentiment and consciousness of its power, he cannot well conceive that it was composed with great energy of mental action. We should call the thought in this book just and true thought rather than strong thought. Its strength is made weakness by excessive expansion. A piece of solid metallic gold furnishes some resistance to whatever touches it, but it loses that quality, though it is still gold, when it is changed into a gas. The mind of our author, as it appears in the work before us, seems to be a magazine furnished with all varieties of thought and knowledge, rather than a strong, logical, *reasoning* mind. It seems to possess little of that mastering power of intellect, by which all the ideas expressed upon a given subject are kept in a constant state of convergency towards some distinct end. There is, to be sure, a great appearance of method. We have those numberless series of divisions which we so often meet with in the old writers. But every day we see how completely the form of method may be preserved while its spirit is lost. The method of our author is not so much a method regulated according to the universal laws of mind as by the somewhat arbitrary fancies and periods of his own mind. He has the discursiveness with nothing like the richness or power of Jeremy Taylor. We do sometimes meet with a very good thought,—and oftentimes with one that is pleasant from its quaintness. We will make a short extract in illustration.

"Gifts are bestowed to trade with for God; opportunities are the market-days for that trade. To napkin up the one and let slip the other, will end in trouble and perplexities of heart. God loses a revenue of glory by such slothful souls; and he will make them sensible of it."—p. 28.

This whole work, consisting of 252 pages, is employed in an exposition on the 130th Psalm. The Psalm itself, which is comprised in eight verses, is very simple and easy of comprehension. And perhaps the efforts to give such unreasonable extension to the few, though exceedingly beautiful and touching, thoughts of the original, has been one great cause of that dilution of ideas and that want of method of which we complain. Many trains of thought, possessing considerable intrinsic value, have but little of pertinence or direct bearing upon the subject discussed.

It may be said that the intention of such a work as the present being to extend the power of practical religion, all that is wanted is a depth and fullness of pious emotion, and that conciseness of style and a close logical order of thought are qualities of comparatively little importance. Such a remark as this would seem to us to discover very little knowledge of the intimacy and nature of that union which subsists between the intellectual and moral nature. Right thought has a natural alliance with deep feeling. We are strongly moved when there is *occasion* to be moved. There is a connection between truth and the heart. The character of the life is determined by the influence of truth on the heart. It was in view of truth, presented in a clear and condensed form, that the Athenians cried out, "Let us march against Philip." It was in view of clear and orderly truth, that Paul poured forth a sudden burst of pious feeling in the exclamation, "Thanks be unto God for his unspeakable gift." And the truth must be impressed upon the heart in a consistent and logical method, in order to excite *strong* and *consistent* emotion. Even a *pious* mind, if it present only those loose trains of thought which may chance to succeed each other in its own experience, can hardly make its reverential and grateful emotions strongly felt by others, or excite in them emotions of a kindred nature. The topic we have here touched we think of great importance. We have hardly *stated* it, yet we have no space to give it such development as it deserves.

By what we have said, we by no means wish to have it supposed that we believe the work before us to possess no value. The faults which we think we have marked in it are not faults entirely peculiar to itself. But we do wish that works of this description, intended chiefly to move the heart, might have a more just, philosophical adaptation to its character and wants, believing that, with such adaptation, they would effect a vastly greater amount of good than they do. A man must possess and exhibit *mental* power, to make his *moral* power act through the press upon the hearts of his fellow-men. B.

CORRESPONDENCE AND INTELLIGENCE.

FIFTH LETTER TO REV. ADIN BALLOU.

Harward, October 13, 1834.

Dear Sir,

I did say, "I should be glad if our brethren of the Restorationist denomination could feel justified in giving their distinguishing doctrines a less conspicuous place,—in dwelling on them with less frequency, and in

considering them of less importance. They might insist on a future righteous retribution without defining the duration of it; neither asserting nor denying its eternity in their daily instruction." But it seems from your reply, that you cannot do this conveniently, consistently, or conscientiously. If your peculiar doctrine is so important in your estimation; and if so many reasons urge you to proclaim it, I will submit, without attempting to turn you from what you consider the path of duty. And if you feel constrained to pursue this course, I trust you will not think it strange, if others, who entertain different opinions, do not always sympathize and coöperate with you. I have thought and wished there might be more union, sympathy, and coöperation between us; and I know of no better way to secure it than the one I suggested above. I would not encourage disguise and duplicity, nor counsel one to conceal his sentiments, nor to hide important gospel truths; but we may overrate the importance of those opinions which distinguish us from our brethren. We are very apt to do so. It has however afforded me a greater pleasure to observe in how many things others agreed with me, than it has to observe in how many things we differed. I love society; I would gladly have intercourse with all pious persons. I want their sympathy and counsel. It is painful to me to think that our fellowship and communion are so sadly interrupted. How often have I felt the need of Christian associates, to whom I could confidently disclose my hopes and fears, my joys and sorrows; with whom I might earnestly engage in religious conversation, and know that it was equally interesting to them as to myself! And how often has such a privilege been denied me! And why? Were there no pious persons in my neighbourhood? Yes, many. But differences in faith kept them strangers to me.

You mention the course you had pursued as a religious teacher;—it will be my apology for stating what has generally been my own. I have often gone to preach in those places where many were opposed to my faith; where Unitarianism is identified with all that is vile and odious. I did not, on such occasions, consider it important that I should tell them in so many words, that I was a Unitarian. This was already known to my employers, and it was known also to those with whom I was not connected and who might hear me, if they had the desire and courage. Nor have I been forward to introduce controverted topics. In such places, where I was only to spend a Sabbath or two, or give a single lecture, my preaching has been more generally practical. I have dwelt on those subjects which can never be justly deemed unimportant nor unseasonable. Seldom, if ever, on such occasions, have I laboured to disprove the doctrine of the Trinity. It was no secret to my audience that I was a Unitarian. But many of my hearers knew not what importance I attached to the practical and vital parts of Christianity. They knew that I rejected the doctrine of the Trinity. But rumour had been busy in telling them, that I rejected the Bible also,—that I was an enemy to God and Christ, in disguise,—that I was secretly attempting to destroy the authority and influence of religion,—that I made no account of repentance, regeneration, prayer, and a holy and devout life,—that I felt no solicitude about the spiritual and eternal welfare of my fellow-men,—that my views of religion had nothing in them to arouse the conscience, to touch and warm the heart, to guide the sinner into the way of salvation, and to sustain the soul under all the trying circumstances of life. It has been my wish and endeavour to remove such prejudices, and to efface such wrong impressions,—to let it be known that, though I was a Unitarian, I professed and desired to be a Christian also,—that I felt interested and earnest in the cause of religion, and in the progress of virtue and holiness,—that I wished not only to increase the number of those who would be receivers and advocates of the doctrine of the divine Unity, but also to increase the number of those who would be the faithful and humble followers of Jesus Christ, and who would adorn a profession of godliness with a pious life. So I

have urged upon my hearers the duties of repentance, faith, prayer, personal holiness, and growth in grace and Christian knowledge. I have endeavoured to excite in them a deeper interest in religion,—a greater reverence for the gospel,—a more lively sense of their accountability to God,—a more earnest inquiry about what they must do to be saved,—and a more careful and constant attention to the things belonging to their peace. I have endeavoured to guard them against infidelity, fanaticism, and uncharitableness,—to exhibit not only the plain doctrines of the gospel, but also to direct their attention to its precepts and spirit. I have been more earnest to tell my hearers what I did believe, than what I disbelieved,—and to leave the impression on their minds that I had a stronger desire that they should become disciples of Christ, than members of any religious party. I have thought that in this way I could do more for the cause of truth and holiness than by discussing some controverted subject, which might fix the attention and gratify an idle curiosity, but would do nothing for the heart. There are a great many who are sadly indifferent and stupid about religion, even when it is divested of all that is irrational and superstitious. While they can hear no preacher but an Orthodox one, they are negligent and would find an excuse for their not joining the church and for their absence from public worship in the creed to which they must assent, and in the minister who is to guide them in their devotions and instruct them. But remove these obstacles; give them the privileges and advantages which they imagine would satisfy them; and are they constant at church? Do they become professors of religion? Too many of them still remain heedless and bold. They join a Restorationist or a Unitarian society, and continue to neglect their religious duties. They love to talk about the absurdities and extravagances of Orthodoxy; but vital, personal piety is what they have never felt the need of. I have supposed that many such persons come to hear us preach, not because they wish to know the truth, so that by it they may become holy and free; not because they are anxious to learn what they must do to be saved, but because they hope to hear something said against Orthodoxy. They admire and applaud us, not as disciples and ministers of Christ, but as opposers of Calvinism. I am a Unitarian, and I am neither ashamed nor afraid to confess it. I should rejoice to have all embrace the same faith, since I believe it to be the faith of the glorious gospel. But I should not be satisfied with barely winning their assent to my creed, and with numbering them as belonging to my denomination; my object is not attained till they become Christians in heart and life.

You will excuse me, my dear brother, for dwelling so long on these things. Though we may differ in doctrine, and in our methods of operating upon the minds of others, I trust we both feel earnest to promote the cause of truth and piety. If you will not charge me with flattery, I will here tell you with what pleasure I have read some of the last numbers of the Messenger. They contained but little that was controversial, and much that was practical; and while they were almost silent about your peculiar doctrine, they were calculated to do much for it by the earnestness with which they enforced practical piety. Not that the preceding numbers were destitute of practical instruction; but in these I thought it abounded. It gave me the impression that your paper was changing for the better, and that its influence would be more salutary. When I read the religious journals and papers published by other sects, I am eager to know, not only with what arguments and spirit, with what frequency and power, they defend their peculiar tenets, but also what attention they pay to the precepts of religion generally. And when I discover that they are earnestly and often enforcing all the great Christian duties included in denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, and in living soberly, righteously, and piously, it gives me a delightful sensation. There is a great deal of sin and misery in the world; and when I see men, by whatever name they may be called, ardently and perseveringly engaged in meliorating

the human condition, it makes my heart glad. It inclines me to think of their errors in doctrine with more patience and charity.

I have taken no notice of your answers to my letters which have appeared in the Unitarian, and which you have had the generosity to publish in the Messenger. I have been silent about them, not through disrepect nor indifference, but because I found it would be attended with considerable difficulty and inconvenience, were I to reply to each of them, while answering your first letter. I know not, indeed, whether you expected it; I barely mention it here to prevent any disagreeable thoughts in regard to the subject; I ought to have mentioned it sooner. Forgive me, if it has occasioned you any solicitude.

I am, dear sir, your friend and brother,

JONATHAN FARR.

REV. ADIN BALLOU.

THE BOSTON SUNDAY-SCHOOL SOCIETY.

The general objects of this society are in this vicinity well known, as are also its annual meetings, holden for the purpose of collecting information relative to the prosperity of the great cause of religious education throughout the State, and of giving to benevolent hearts new impulses to effort in the promotion of that cause. Hereafter the managers of the society propose, and, as we think, most wisely, to hold quarterly meetings of the society, at each of which reports may be read from several of the schools, and mutual excitement gained from the sympathy of the meeting and from the remarks which gentlemen may offer on any of the interesting topics embraced in the general subjects of Sunday-school instruction. We have said we think this plan a wise one Even "pure minds" need to be stirred up "by way of remembrance." And we are induced to insert this notice on account of the strong satisfaction, and, as we trust, the *lasting* excitement which we gained from attending the first of these quarterly meetings which was holden the 7th ult. This meeting was opened by an appropriate prayer from Rev. Mr. Lothrop, and presided over by the venerable Dr. Tuckerman, so distinguished among us for his spirit of benevolence in the cause of the poor,—a benevolence, if we may say it here, possessing a rare combination of traits,—having all the enthusiasm of *ideal*, and all the sober and business-like cast of *practical* philanthropy. Reports, which, we may here remark, are read not to be formally accepted, but to give information of the state of the schools to which they relate, were presented from Rev. Mr. Pierpont's church, Rev. Mr. Lothrop's church, and from Rev. Mr. Barrett's church. After the reading of the reports, the meeting was kept in a constant state of excitement by the remarks of gentlemen interested in the subject and connected with Sunday schools, and was concluded by an impressive address from Rev. Dr. Tuckerman, and the singing of a hymn.

The reports gave a most encouraging account of the success of teachers in the three Sunday schools from which they were made. The children were represented not only as willing to receive instruction, but as hungering for the bread of life,—as longing, with the eagerness of an unsatisfied want, to have those fountains opened within them from which should proceed the "well of water springing up into everlasting life." Every thing indeed that we hear of the results flowing from judicious Sunday-school instruction, gives us a continually strengthening conviction of the power that may be given to the principle of faith even in the child's

mind. In fact we do not ask for any *information* as to success to prove to us that right efforts *must* meet with success. The capacity of the child for religious instruction is established on authority whose obligation can neither be denied nor increased. "Of such is the kingdom of heaven." Let this brief reply be made to all who doubt as to the event of strong benevolent effort in the cause of the young. "Suffer little children to come unto me." No other words need be uttered in the hearing of those who would wave away the young from the altar of instruction and the throne of prayer. Let us not have our minds so entirely closed to the sublimity of that scene with the children as at first were most of the actors immediately concerned in it. Let those who believe that young hearts may have the kingdom of God built up within them, and young hands, perchance, build up that kingdom in the world,—let such draw excitement from the incomparable grandeur with which that scene invests the character of Jesus. The sublimity of the Saviour's words and of the act with which he accompanied them are equalled by the simplicity of the narration. We will even venture to quote the language once more, in hope that the mind of every young reader may gaze upon it till its glory dawns upon his soul. "Then were brought unto him little children that he should put his hands on them and pray: and the disciples rebuked them. But Jesus said, suffer little children, and forbid them not to come unto me: for of such is the kingdom of heaven. And he laid his hands on them and departed thence." Matt. xix. 13—16. These simple words are a bulwark of defence for Christianity which none of the weapons of the infidel can overthrow.

But, in noticing the Sunday-school society, we did not intend to be drawn into such a course of remark on the general object proposed in Sunday schools. One great object of the quarterly meetings of the society is to discuss the comparative wisdom and utility of the different modes of instruction which are pursued in different schools. We would close in saying to those who promote the interests of this society,—God speed you. You are engaged in a humble task, but a great one. You are working silently but with vast effect. Your efforts may not gain you a splendid name, but they will gain you a rejoicing conscience. The world may not praise you now with its *voice*, but it will praise you with its *character* ages hence.

ORDINATIONS AND INSTALLATION.

Mr. George W. Briggs was ordained at Fall River, Sept. 24. Sermon by Rev. F. A. Farley of Providence.

Mr. John L. Russel was ordained at Salem, Oct. 9. Sermon by Rev. Charles C. Sewall.

Mr. Horatio Wood was ordained at Walpole, Sept. 24. Sermon by Rev. Jason Whitman.

Mr. Samuel May was ordained at Leicester, Sept. 13. Sermon by Rev. F. W. P. Greenwood.

Rev. Benjamin Huntoon was installed over the First Congregational Parish, in Milton, Oct. 15. Sermon by Rev. Dr. Harris.

Several gentlemen within the last few months have been ordained to preach the everlasting Gospel in the West. We shall give an account of these ordinations in our next in connection with some appropriate remarks.

MONTHLY LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS,

JUST RECEIVED BY

JAMES MUNROE AND CO.

Visit to Texas; with Descriptions of Scenery, Habits, &c. 12mo.
Christmas Box for 1835. Plates. 18mo.
Mather on the Types. 12mo.
Affection's Gift, for Youth. Plates. 18mo.
The Oasis. Edited by Mrs. Child. Plates. 16mo.
Beckford's Italy; with Sketches of Spain and Portugal. 2 vols. 12mo.
Belgium and Western Germany in 1833. By Mrs. Trollope. 8vo.
History of England from the Earliest Times to the year 1588, by Sir James Mackintosh. 8vo.
District School, by J. Orville Taylor. 12mo.
Mothers and Daughters. 2 vols. 12mo.
Defence of the Revolutionary History of N. Carolina from the Aspersions of Mr. Jefferson. By Jo. Seawell Jones. 12mo.
Bernardo del Carpio. From the Spanish of Don Jorge Montgomery. 12mo.
Connection of the Physical Sciences, by Mrs. Somerville. 12mo.
Pictures of Private Life. 2d Series. By Sarah Stickney. 12mo.

JAMES MUNROE & CO.

HAVE JUST RECEIVED FROM

THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION

THE FOLLOWING INVOICE OF

VALUABLE ENGLISH WORKS.

Unitarianism the Doctrine of the Gospel, by Lant Carpenter, 3d edition.
Farmer's Dissertation on Miracles, 3d edition.
Farmer's Essay on the Demoniacs of the N. Testament, 3d edition.
Priestley's Memoirs, with Observations on his Writings, by T. Cooper and W. Christie; and Four Posthumous Discourses, 2 vols.
Milton's Last Thoughts on the Trinity.
Bible Stories, Part 2d, containing Stories from the N. Testament, by S. Wood.
Price's Four Dissertations, 5th edition.
Belsham's Translation and Exposition of Paul's Epistles, with Notes, 4 vols.
Belsham's Memoirs of Lindsey, 2d edition.
Traité on l'on Expose ce que l'Écriture nous apprend de la Divinité de Jesus Christ, par P. F. Le Courayer.
Cellérier's Discourse on the Authenticity and Divine Origin of the Old Testament, with Notes and Illustrations; translated from the French by J. R. Wreford.
Tagart on the Claims of Unitarian Christianity to the Respectful Consideration of the Reflecting Public.
Barker's Church-Establishment Anti-Christian, &c.
Harris's Harmony of Nature, Providence, and Christianity.
Review of Smith's Scripture Testimony to the Messiah.
Orthodoxy and Unbelief, by Ed. Higginson.
Joyce's Analysis of Paley's View of the Evidences of Christianity, 7th edition.
The Word made Flesh; A Sermon before the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, by W. Hincks.
Ashworth's Account of the Rise and Progress of the Unitarian Doctrine in the Societies at Rochdale, 2d edition.
Brief Dissertation on the Ministration of the Divine Word by Public Preaching, by Rob. Robinson.
Priestley's Unitarianism Explained and Defended.
Priestley's Outline of the Evidences of Revealed Religion.
Lardner's Letter on the Logos.
Yates on the Unity of God.
Whyte's Sermons on Doctrinal and Practical Subjects, 2d edition.

JAMES MUNROE AND CO.

HAVE JUST PUBLISHED,

Ware's Life of the Saviour, *stereotype edition.*

Lowth's Isaiah, from the tenth English edition, carefully correcte and revised.

Stewart's Philosophy of the Human Mind. 8vo. 2d ed.

Briggs's Sermon at the Installation of Rev. A. B. Muzzey.

Wood's Discourse, on Gospel-Truths.

Two Discourses delivered before the First Parish in Cambridge one, upon leaving the Old Meeting House, and the other, at the Dedication of the New. By William Newell, Pastor of the First Church in Cambridge.

Sunday-School and Parish Libraries will be promptly furnished, to order, on the most liberal terms.

Orders for any work published either in this country or in Europe will be attended to without delay.

The establishment of an hourly communication with the city, by coaches and baggage-wagons, enables us to assure distant customers of the execution of all orders transmitted by mail, with about the same despatch as can be had in Boston.

Liberal terms will be allowed to authors who may favour us with the publication of their works. No pains will be spared to bring out all books in good style and with despatch, and to give them extensive circulation.

Hudson and Grant, Printers, Cambridge.

THE

Stanford Library
MAY 15 1945
B

UNITARIAN.

Vol. I. No. 12.

DECEMBER, 1834.

CONDUCTED

BY BERNARD WHITMAN.

CAMBRIDGE
AND
BOSTON:
JAMES MUNROE AND COMPANY,
BOOKSELLERS TO THE UNIVERSITY.
1834.

[illegible] sheets—Postage, under 100 miles, 3 cents—over 100 miles, 5 cents.

CONTENTS.

Our Saviour's Example. L.
Letters to Unbelievers. No. VI. *Religious Belief of Immortality.* B. Whitman.
Considerations for Philosophical Rejecters of the Christian Faith.
On the Characteristics of St. John's Gospel. F. H. Hedge.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Counsels to Young Men on Modern Infidelity, and the Evidences of Christianity. C. A. B.
Letters to the Young. C. A. B.

CORRESPONDENCE AND INTELLIGENCE.

Sixth Letter to the Rev. Adin Ballou.
Obituary. C. A. B.
Notice.

NOTICE.

Subscribers who have not yet remitted the amount due for this work (two dollars) are respectfully requested to make payment immediately; as the death of the editor and joint-proprietor, Rev. Mr. Whitman, renders it necessary to adjust the concerns of The Unitarian as speedily as possible.

MONTHLY LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS,

JUST RECEIVED BY

JAMES MUNROE AND CO.

Life of Prince Talleyrand; accompanied with a portrait. 1 vol. 8vo.
Elements of Psychology; including a Critical Examination of Locke's Essay on the Human Understanding; by Victor Cousin. Translated from the French, with an Introduction, Notes, and Additions. By C. S. Henry.
The Beauties of the Court of Charles II.; a Series of Memoirs, Biographical and Critical, illustrating the Diaries of Pepys, Evelyn, Clarendon, and other contemporary writers. By Mrs. Jameson.
The Hunchback of Notre Dame, in 2 vols. By Victor Hugo.
The Works of Robert Burns, with his Life. By Allan Cunningham, in 4 vols.
The Parent's Present; edited by the author of Peter Parley's Tales.
The Last Days of Pompeii. By the author of "Pelham," "England and the English," &c.
The Pacha of Many Tales. By the author of Jacob Faithful.
Journal of a Residence in China and the Neighbouring Countries, from 1827 to 1833. By David Abeel, a Minister of the Dutch Reformed Church in North America, &c.
Letters to a Gentleman in Germany, written after a Trip from Philadelphia to Niagara; edited by F. Lieber.
Usury Laws, Monopoly, Gallican Liberties, &c. &c. By Rev. J. O. Callaghan.

NOTICE.

The Publishers of The Unitarian would give notice that after the present number the publication of this journal will be discontinued,—arrangements having been made for the transfer of their subscription-list to the proprietor of The Christian Register, a weekly religious paper, printed in Boston, and edited by the Rev. Sidney Willard. The high character to which The Register has attained, under the care of its present accomplished and able editor, is such as to render any recommendation of it from us wholly unnecessary. The public are sufficiently aware that, both as respects the ability with which it is conducted, and the interest with which it is universally read, it now yields to no journal of its class, by whatever denomination issued. It is therefore with much satisfaction that we find ourselves enabled to offer to our patrons this substitute for The Unitarian. The Register will be sent to our subscribers generally. Those who do not wish to receive it, are requested to signify the same, previously to the first of January, by returning some one of the numbers which may be sent them, directed to "The Christian Register, Boston, Mass."

Cambridge, Dec. 1, 1834.

THE

UNITARIAN.

CONDUCTED

BY BERNARD WHITMAN.

CAMBRIDGE
AND
BOSTON:
JAMES MUNROE AND COMPANY,
BOOKSELLERS TO THE UNIVERSITY.
1834.

Cambridge.
Metcalfe and Grant, Printers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

MISCELLANY.

	Page
A Holy Life the most Persuasive Argument,	10
Analogy of Debts and Sins,	213
Athanasian Creed,	289
Calvinists (and Trinitarians), Letters to	17, 67
Christ the Teacher of Immortality,	495
Christian, Denomination, the	489
Christianity a Universal Religion,	111, 189
Christianity and Reform,	51
Christianity, Unreasonable Modes of attacking	136
Coming of the Son of Man,	220, 356
Debts and Sins, Analogy of	213
Gibbon's Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire,—Closing Paragraph of its 15th Chapter,	127
Heresy, the Unitarian	517
Infidelity,	488
Infidelity,—Means of Providing its Cure and Preventing its Spread,	359, 413, 454
Intelligent Men, the Religion of	335
Jesus a Divine Teacher of Morals,	315, 421
John's Gospel, Characteristics of	567
Letter addressed to Rev. L. W.	475, 504
Liberality of Sentiment, an Essay on	450
Malcolm on Witchcraft,	387
Manufactures in their Influence upon Pauperism,	224, 310, 351, 399
Meaning of the Text Matt. xxviii. 19,	303
Memoir of Saint Simon,	279
Men accountable for their Faith,	370
Names,	447
Obstacles (some of the) to be overcome in the Search for Truth,	255
Pauperism,	59, 224, 310, 351, 399
Philosophical Rejecters of the Christian Faith, Considerations for	52[illegible], 557
Prophecy of the Destruction of Jerusalem,	318
Prosperity of its Societies the true Policy of a Sect,	508
Reasons for spreading Unitarianism,	150
Reform (and Christianity),	30
Review of the supposed danger of hoping to be saved on the ground of Obedience to the Gospel,	168
Religious Condition and Wants of the Community,—a Letter to the Editors,	3
Salvation by Jesus,	339

Page

Saviour's Example, - - - - - - 543
Scripture Truth sufficiently obvious, - - - 483
Signs of the Times, - - - - - - 465
Son of Man, - - - - - - - - 78
South, Letters from - - - - - - 72, 117
Spirituality of Religion,—Goodwin's Sermons, - - 405
Study of the Scriptures, - - - - - 215, 263
Supposed Evangelical Views in England, - - - 124
Trinitarians and Calvinists, Letters to - - - 17, 67
Unbelievers, Letters to - - 85, 136, 177, 227, 522, 546
Unitarian, the - - - - - - - 1
Unitarian Heresy, the - - - - - - - 517
Unitarian (the) abroad, - - - - - - 434
Unitarianism of the first three Centuries of the Christian Era, 377, 427
Vision (a) of Daniel, - - - - - - - 267
Witchcraft (and Malcolm), - - - - - - 387
Workingmen's Party, - - - - - - - 170
Zeal, True and False - - - - - - - 207
Zeal without Knowledge, - - - - - - 273

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Address to the Pupils of the South Parish Sunday-School in Portsmouth, N. H., the Sabbath after the Interment of Rev. N. Parker, D. D. By a Teacher, - - - - - - 148
Arguments of the Attorney of the Commonwealth in Kneeland's Trial, - - - - - - - - - 346
Book of Mormon, - - - - - - - - 40
Bulfinch's Holy Land and its Inhabitants, - - - 389
Bulfinch's Poems, - - - - - - - 343
Christian Knowledge Society's Tracts, - - - 248
Christianity, Evidences of,—Letters to Young Men, - 571
Deist's Immortality, and an Essay on Man's Accountability for his Belief, - - - - - - - - - 146
Discourse on Education, - - - - - - 101
Dissertation on Native Depravity, - - - - - 97
Dunlap's Speech in Defence of Abner Kneeland, - - 346
Eaton's Sermon on the Test of Christian Character, - - 393
Essay on Demoniacs, - - - - - - - 107
Farewell Sermon. By Rev. Wells Bushnell, - - - 106
Goodwin's Sermons, - - - - - - - 405
Gospel-Truths, - - - - - - - - 147
Griffin on the Divine Efficiency, - - - - - 197
Gurney's Portable Evidence of Christianity, - - - 196
Infidelity, Modern,—Letters to Young Men, - - - 571
Instructions for Young Christians, - - - - - 289
Jewsbury's Letters to the Young, - - - - - 575
Literary and Theological Review, - - - - - 198
Owen's Exposition on Psalm CXXX, - - - - 536
Philip's Manly Piety, - - - - - - - 245
Prayers for Children and Young Persons, - - - 490
Smith on Divine Government, - - - - - - 392
Taylor's Social Evils and their Remedy, - - - 238
Ware's Priestley, - - - - - - - 390

CORRESPONDENCE AND INTELLIGENCE.

	Page
Agency of the American Unitarian Association,	158
Boston Sunday-School Society,	541
Divinity School of Harvard University,	295
Duty of Clergymen in relation to the Temperance Reform,	204
Editor's Notice,	206
Extract from a Letter to one of the Editors,	108
Extract from a Letter from H——, Worcester County, Mass.	157
" " " " Wilmington, Delaware,	157
Extracts from a Letter from Richmond,	156
Extracts of Letters from a Mormonite,	251
Infidel Meetings in Boston,	298
Infidel Missionaries,	250
Installation,	158, 542
Installations,	302
Installation,	110
Lectures on the Evidences and on Unitarianism,	157
Letter of Mr. Harding,	438
Letter from Rev. Adin Ballou,	199
Letters to Rev. Adin Ballou,	348, 395, 442, 492, 538, 576
Letter on the Coldness of New England Preaching,	153
Letter from Berkshire County,	253
Letter from Buffalo, N. Y.	250
Letter on Moral Reform,	398
Letter to the Editor of the Unitarian,	445
Ordinations,	542
Prison Discipline Society,	394
Queries,	158
Salem Controversy,	202
Theological Discussion in Boston,	254
Unitarian Church in Meadville, Penn.	108
Unitarianism in Detroit,	110
West (the) as a Field of Usefulness for Young Preachers of the Unitarian Denomination,—A Letter from Louisville,	154
Whitman, Bernard, Obituary Notice of	579
Wylie, President of Bloomington College,	300

THE UNITARIAN.

VOL. I. DECEMBER 1, 1834. No. 12.

Our Saviour's Example.

AN unbeliever once said to Dr. Paley, that if God had given a revelation, he would have written it in the skies. The remark was as unphilosophical as it was untrue in fact. It overlooked human nature, and the way by which man is influenced. The reason which the doubter would have probably given why a revelation should be written in the skies, would have been that all men in all countries would thus be able to see it, to read, and to have it standing ever before them. But this mode of making all men accept revelation would, to say nothing of other considerations, be the one to lead all men to neglect it—reject it. If man were endowed with intellect alone, the scheme might be effectual; it would then matter little whence religion came, provided it only came. The truth would be equally quick and powerful whether it were traced in blazing characters along the overarching sky, or painted on the leaves of the forest, or muttered in the rippling brook, or sounded abroad by the thunder. To know would be to accept it. There would be no unbelievers, and no virtue in being a believer. No room would exist to exercise belief or unbelief. All would know with mathematical certainty what was revealed, and all would be placed under an inevitable, uncontrollable constraint to receive it. But our nature is not thus one-sided and unbalanced. We have the capacity of feeling and choosing as well as thinking. A will and the affections are united with the intellect. And we wanted not a cold revelation inscribed on the sky, but one of living warmth, uttered from living lips, gushing up from a heart like our hearts, and acted out in a tempted, sorrow-stricken, yet hopeful life, such as we live. Such a revelation

we have. And in the manner by which God addressed it to us we see abundant proof that the same Being made the revelation who made us, and abundant cause to excite our gratitude that when the Almighty did reveal himself, it was with so much mercy and kindness. Jesus Christ was the revelation. Jesus Christ, as he lived and laboured, taught and suffered, was crucified and rose again from the dead. The truth was not an abstraction,—distant, speculative, lifeless,—but embodied in a living soul, which bore all the infirmities we bear, was "in all points tempted as we are," and which, after passing through a life of unexampled hardship and suffering, came out of the fiery ordeal perfectly unstained, victorious over sin, and victorious over the grave. Jesus did all this, and he did it through the power of that very truth which he was sent to preach to us. Thus he was a perfect Mediator, or Interposer, between God and man. He possessed all the truth which God wished to communicate to man on the one hand, and on the other he was a man, and could therefore be sympathized with by other men, in all the trials and sorrows he was obliged to undergo in promulgating that truth.

When we consider, therefore, that he is our pattern in all things, and that he taught both by his actions and his precepts, we read the brief history of his life with an eager curiosity to see how he acted upon different occasions, and treated different persons; whether he was really perfect, whether there may not have been some unguarded moment in his sublime career, when he took an unguarded step and sinned. And when one has read through the artless story from end to end, and seen that there was *no* unguarded moment, not one in all that eventful, and distracted, and persecuted life, how can he fail to bow down before the Saviour, and acknowledge that he was the manifestation of the Infinite God!

The history which the Evangelists give of Christ is short. A great many actions and lessons are omitted. "And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written." (John xxi. 25.) The imagination, accordingly, when under the proper restraints, is able to draw a just, as well as large picture from what is said in very few words. Some short sentences, looked at in this way, become full of significance and power. Such are those which mention the fact of little children being brought to Jesus and kindly treated, and blessed by him. The ministry of Jesus was now drawing to a close.

He has left Galilee for the last time. He is soon to offer himself up for the redemption of the world. While the dark prospect of an ignominious and cruel death is shutting around him, and the great object of his life is filling his mind with a grander and grander interest, as he approaches its accomplishment, he has nevertheless time to do every duty, great and small, to bear patiently with his disciples in their mistakes and prejudices, to work miracles, to travel from place to place, to preach to assembled multitudes. Yes; the Saviour of the world, at the most active period of his intensely active ministry, when everything was wound up to the highest pitch, and we may suppose his mind dwelt much on that solemn and mysterious tragedy soon to be enacted, finds time to show that affectionate interest in little children, and to pay them those kind attentions, which even the good are every day seen to neglect and disregard almost without being conscious that they are not doing what is perfectly right. Mark the scene. Jesus is healing the sick and dispensing the gospel of the kingdom to a vast multitude, collected to hear him in a place east of the river Jordan. Children are brought to him to have him lay his hands on them and bless them, showing at least the confidence of the parents that Jesus was a great and good man, however they might regard his claim to the Messiahship. The disciples are angry and repulse them. To them it seems an unreasonable intrusion. "Our master is engaged about more important matters than attending to little children. He has higher duties to perform than to play the fondler. Take the children away." How unlike Jesus! He directs a look of reproof at the disciples, calls back the children, frightened away by the harsh voices and angry expressions, speaks kindly to them, and then, as if touched with the tender recollections of his own sainted infancy, and the blessing which he had received in the arms of the venerable and holy Simeon, takes them up in his arms and blesses them! What a beautiful and affecting incident! How it must have endeared him to the parents of the children themselves! What a thrill of delight must have run through the hearts of the little ones to be so affectionately treated! And, as many a fond mother has bent over her child from that time downward, and thought of the Saviour's love for little children and his blessing upon them, how her own love to him has been animated! And when the blessed boon has been withdrawn, how consoling the reflection that the infant spirit has mounted on high to be with him forever who was so affectionate and kind to little children while

he was still on the earth! The world, as it sweeps on with its noise, and tumult, and selfishness, may lightly esteem this scene in the life of Jesus; but it teaches to every parent a lesson of most holy and precious truth, and hallows the relation he bears to his children with the Saviour's love. It is a scene to be remembered by every instructor of the young. It should go with the Sunday-school teacher, and animate him in all his duties. And, while engaged in providing for and instructing the young, both parent and teacher should remember that they will be paid over and over again for all they do, if they transfer to their own hearts and characters that innocence and simplicity, upon which Jesus pronounced his blessing. L.

Letters to Unbelievers.

No. VI.

RELIGIOUS BELIEF OF BENJAMIN FRANKLIN.

FELLOW CITIZENS,

You perceive that he calls the Hebrew records the most faithful of all histories. This is all the merit the authors themselves ever claimed, in relation to a large portion of the Old Testament.

Dr. Franklin considered ridiculing the Scriptures a species of profaneness. He used the following language respecting one Dr. Brown, whom he met with on his journey to Philadelphia.

"He had some letters, and was ingenious, but he was an infidel, and *wickedly* undertook, some years after, to turn the Bible into doggerel verse. By this means he set many *facts* in a ridiculous light, and might have done mischief with *weak minds*, if his work had been published; but it never was."—*Life*, p. 18.

"About the year 1734, there arrived among us a young Presbyterian preacher, named Hemphill, who delivered with a good voice, and apparently extempore, most excellent discourses, which drew together considerable numbers of different persuasions, who joined in admiring him. Among the rest, I became one of his constant hearers, his sermons pleasing me, as they had little of the dogmatical kind, but inculcated strongly the practice of virtue, or what in the religious style are called good works.

Those however of our congregation who considered themselves as Orthodox Presbyterians, disapproved his doctrine, and were joined by most of the old ministers, who arraigned him of heterodoxy before the Synod, in order to have him silenced. I became his zealous partisan, and contributed all I could to raise a party in his favour, and combatted for him awhile with some hopes of success.

"During the contest an unlucky occurrence hurt his cause exceedingly. One of our adversaries having heard him preach a sermon that was much admired, thought he had somewhere read the sermon before, or at least a part of it. On searching he found that part quoted at length in one of the British Reviews, from a discourse of Dr. Foster's. This detection gave many of our party disgust, who accordingly abandoned his cause, and occasioned our more speedy discomfiture in the Synod. I stuck by him however. I rather approved his giving us good sermons composed by others, than bad ones of his own manufacture; though the latter was the practice of our common teachers. He afterwards acknowledged to me that none of those he preached were his own; adding that his memory was such as enabled him to retain and repeat any sermon after once reading only. On our defeat he left us in search elsewhere of better fortune, and I quitted the congregation, never attending it after; though I continued many years my subscription for the support of its ministers."—*Life*, p. 79.

A most important fact is here disclosed. Benjamin Franklin was actually excluded from public worship by useless, uninteresting, unscriptural preaching.

Dr. Franklin's views of a future life were rational and scriptural. The following extracts from familiar letters will confirm my statement.

"I condole with you. We have lost a most dear and valuable relation. But it is the will of God and nature, that these mortal bodies be laid aside, when the soul is to enter into real life. This is rather an embryo state, a preparation for living. A man is not completely born until he be dead. Why then should we grieve, that a new child is born among the immortals, a new member added to their happy society? We are spirits. That bodies should be lent us, while they can afford us pleasure, assist us in acquiring knowledge, or in doing good to our fellow-creatures, is a kind and benevolent act of God. When they become unfit for these purposes, and afford us pain instead of pleasure, instead of an aid become an encumbrance, and answer none of the intentions for which they were given, it is equally kind and benevolent, that a way is provided by which we may get rid of them. Death is that way. We ourselves, in some

cases, prudently choose a partial death. A mangled, painful limb, which cannot be restored, we willingly cut off. He who plucks out a tooth, parts with it freely, since the pain goes with it, and he who quits the whole body, parts at once with all pains and possibilities of pains and diseases, which it was liable to, or capable of making him suffer. Our friend and we were invited abroad on a party of pleasure, which is to last forever. His chair was ready first; and he is gone before us. We could not all conveniently start together; and why should you and I be grieved at this, since we are soon to follow, and know where to find him."—*Letters*, p. 39.

From several sentences which I have quoted, you perceive that Dr. Franklin firmly believed in future rewards and punishments.

Dr. Franklin entertained scriptural views on the subject of practical religion. To prove the truth of this assertion, I shall bring together several extracts on a variety of topics. He wished to have children educated in the belief and practice of the gospel. He drew up a plan for an English school in Philadelphia; and in this is contained the following recommendation of a religious book for the fourth class.

"Dr. Johnson's *Ethica*, or first principles of morality may now be read by the scholars, and explained by the master, to lay a solid foundation of *virtue* and *piety* in their minds."—*Works*, Vol. V. p. 171. English edition.

Now the book here recommended was published by the Rev. Samuel Johnson, President of King's College, New York; and it is designed to explain and defend natural and revealed religion. Would an unbeliever, especially would any of our modern unbelievers, introduce such a work among children and youth. One extract will confirm my statement.

"Having thus given a short sketch of the first principles of moral philosophy, or what is called the religion of nature, I shall now conclude by giving a very short summary of *revealed religion*, and show the connection between them and Christianity, or the religion of the Mediator, which is to be considered the great infallible means of our instruction and reformation, for begetting, improving, and perfecting in us all the virtues of an honest heart, and a good life, and for ascertaining to us the favour of God, and a blessed immortality, to which it is so admirably subservient, that *it should seem the greatest inconsistency imaginable for a man to be a real friend to what is called natural religion or morality, and at the same time not to adhere firmly to the Christian system.*"—*Ethica*, p. 91.

The firm belief of Dr. Franklin, that nothing but true religion can give us permanent happiness, is expressed in the following quotation.

"The passions, by being too much conversant with earthly objects, can never fix in us a proper composure and acquiescence of mind. Nothing but an indifference to the things of this world, an entire submission to the will of Providence here, and a well grounded expectation of happiness hereafter, can give us a true, satisfactory enjoyment of ourselves. Virtue is the best guard against the many unavoidable evils incident to us; nothing better alleviates the weight of the afflictions, or gives a truer relish of the blessings, of human life. Happiness springs immediately from the mind; wealth is but to be considered a candidate or circumstance, without which this happiness cannot be considered pure and unabated. There is no happiness then but in a virtuous and self-approving conduct. Unless our actions will bear the test of our sober judgments and reflections upon them, they are not the actions, and consequently not the happiness of, a rational being."—*Works*, Vol. V. pp. 94, 95. English edition.

"I thank God there are not in the whole world any who are my enemies as a *man;* for by his grace, through a long life, I have been enabled so to conduct myself, that there does not exist a human being who can justly say, Ben Franklin has wronged me. This, my friend, is in old age a comfortable reflection."—*Works*, Vol. VI. p. 122.

"One's true happiness depends more upon one's own judgment of one's self, or a consciousness of rectitude in action and intention, and the approbation of those few who judge impartially, than upon the applause of the unthinking, undiscerning multitude, who are apt to cry *hosanna* to-day, and to-morrow, *crucify* him."—*Letters*, p. 99.

"In fine, nothing can contribute to true happiness, that is inconsistent with duty; nor can a course of action, conformable to it, be finally without an ample reward. For God governs, and he is *good*."—*Letters*, p. 116.

He is encouraging people in England to emigrate to this country; and he gives the following as one reason why this country would be a desirable residence.

"Serious religion, under its various denominations, is not only tolerated, but respected and practised. Atheism is unknown; infidelity rare and secret; so that persons may live to a great age in this country, without having their piety shocked by meeting with either an atheist or an infidel. And the Divine Being seems to have manifested his approbation of the mutual forbearance and kindness with which the different sects treat each

other, by the remarkable prosperity with which he has been pleased to favour the whole country."—*Works*, Vol. V. p. 421.

Such was the reverence of Dr. Franklin for the Christian.

Thomas Paine requested Dr. Franklin to examine the manuscript of his Age of Reason, and make criticisms upon the production. In answer the Doctor returned the following very important letter, which all unbelievers would do well to consider.

"I have read your manuscript with some attention. By the argument it contains against a particular Providence, though you allow a general Providence, you strike at the foundations of all religion. For without the belief of a Providence that takes cognizance of, guards and guides, and may favour particular persons, there is no motive to worship a Deity, to fear its displeasure, or to pray for its protection. I will not enter into any discussion of your principles though you seem to desire it. At present I shall only give you my opinion, that though your reasonings are subtle, and may prevail with *some readers*, you will not succeed so as to change the general sentiments of mankind on that subject, and the consequence of printing this piece will be, a great deal of odium drawn upon yourself, mischief to you, and *no benefit* to others. He that spits against the wind, spits in his own face. But were you to succeed, do you imagine any good would be done by it? You yourself may find it easy to live a virtuous life without the assistance afforded by religion; you having a clear perception of the advantages of virtue, and the disadvantages of vice, and possessing a strength of resolution sufficient to enable you to resist common temptations. But think how great a portion of mankind consists of weak and ignorant men and women, and of inexperienced, inconsiderate youth of both sexes, who have need of the motives of religion to restrain them from vice, to support their virtue, and retain them in the practice of it till it becomes *habitual*, which is the great point for its security. And perhaps you are indebted to her originally, that is to your religious education, for the habits of virtue upon which you now justly value yourself. You might easily display your excellent talents of reasoning upon a less hazardous subject, and thereby obtain a rank with our most distinguished authors. For amongst us it is not necessary as among the Hottentots, that a youth, to be raised into the company of men, should prove his manhood by beating his mother. I would advise you, therefore, not to attempt unchaining the tiger, but to burn this piece before it is seen by any other person, whereby you will save yourself a great deal of mortification from the enemies it may raise against you, and perhaps a good deal of regret and repentance. If men are so wicked *with religion*,

what would they be if *without it?* I intend this letter itself as a *proof* of my friendship, and therefore add no *professions* to it; but subscribe simply yours."—*Works*, Vol. VI. pp. 243, 244.

Dr. Franklin had no fear of death. His last days were serene and cheerful. One or two extracts will confirm these statements.

"My health and spirits continue, thanks to God, as when you saw me. But the course of nature must soon put a period to my present mode of existence. This I shall submit to with less regret, as, having seen during a long life a good deal of this world, I feel a growing curiosity to be acquainted with some other; and can cheerfully, with filial confidence, resign my spirit to the conduct of that great and good Parent of mankind who created it, and who has so graciously protected and prospered me from my birth to the present hour."—*Works*, Vol. VI. p. 183.

The following passages were written by the intimate friends and companions of Dr. Franklin. The first is the composition of a lady.

"I was the faithful witness of the closing scene, which he sustained with that calm fortitude which characterized him through life. No repining, no peevish expressions ever escaped him, during a confinement of two years, in which I believe, if every moment of ease could be added together, the sum would not amount to two whole months. When the pain was not too violent to be amused, he employed himself with his books, his pen, or in conversation with his friends; and upon every occasion, displayed the clearness of his intellects and the cheerfulness of his temper. Even when the intervals from pain were so short that his words were frequently interrupted, I have known him hold a discourse in a sublime strain of piety. It is natural for us to wish that an attention to some ceremonies had accompanied that religion of the heart which I am convinced Dr. Franklin always possessed; but let us who feel the benefit of them continue to practise them, without thinking lightly of that piety which could support pain without a murmur, and meet death without terror."—*Monthly Repository*, Vol. XVII. p. 4.

Read also the following extract.

"Yes, we have lost that valued, that venerable, kind friend, whose knowledge enlightened our minds, and whose philanthropy warmed our hearts; but we have the consolation to think, that if a life well spent in acts of universal benevolence to mankind, a grateful acknowledgment of Divine favour, a patient submission under severe chastisement, and an humble trust in Almighty mercy, can insure the happiness of a future state, our present loss is his gain."

The next extract is from a letter of Nicholas Collin to the grandson of Dr. Franklin.

"As I often had the satisfaction of conversing with that immortal sage, your grandsire, in his last illness, the following anecdotes may be of some use, as an additional testimony of facts to mankind. The Doctor had sublime and affecting sentiments of religion. He believed, that by the invariable laws of God in the moral world, all crimes are punished either here or hereafter; and that consequently an evil deed can never be profitable in any case whatever; he was equally persuaded that every good act has its reward. Under a painful disease he expressed a firm confidence, that all the sufferings of this life are but as the momentary pricking of a pin, in comparison to the total happiness of our existence. He rejoiced in a speedy approach to the regions of bliss and life eternal. He dwelt with rapture on the felicity of beholding the glorious Father of Spirits, whose essence is incomprehensible to the wisest mortals; of contemplating his works in the higher worlds; and of conversing there with good fellow-creatues from every part of the universe."—*Life*, p. 416.

Letter from Dr. Rush to Dr. Price.

"Dear Sir,

The papers will inform you of the death of our late illustrious friend, Dr. Franklin. The evening of his life was marked by the same activity of his moral and intellectual powers which distinguished its meridian.

"His conversation with his family upon the subject of his dissolution was free and cheerful. A few days before he died, he rose from his bed, and begged that it might be made up for him, so that he might die in a decent manner. His daughter told him that she hoped he would recover, and live many years longer. He calmly replied he hoped not.

"I had like to have forgotten to mention that he desired in his will that the elegant epitaph, suggested by his original occupation, which he composed for himself some years ago, should be inscribed on his tombstone. By this request he has declared his belief in the Christian doctrine of a resurrection."—*Life of Price.*

There is an article on Franklin's writings in one number of the Edinburgh Review. The writer, who is of Orthodox opinions, makes the following remarks on the religion of Franklin.

"If the example of this eminent person may well teach respect for philanthropic sentiments to one set of scoffers, it may equally impress upon the minds of another class the important lesson,

that veneration for religion is quite compatible with a sound, practical understanding. Franklin was a man of a truly pious turn of mind. The great truths of natural theology were not only deeply engraved on his mind, but continually present to his thoughts. As far as can be collected from his writings, he appears to have been a Christian of the Unitarian school; but if his own faith had not gone so far, he at least would have respected the religion of his country and its professors, and done everything to encourage its propagation, as infinitely beneficial to mankind, even if doubts had existed in his own mind as to some of its fundamental doctrines."

Such are the opinions of Benj. Franklin on religious subjects. You can judge for yourselves whether they are Christian or anti-christian. I suppose you will take his own word for his belief. How happens it then that you claim him as an unbeliever? Because in early life he was led astray for a period. Let us now attend to this point. To understand the reason why and how he became a Deist. You may listen to the following passages from his own pen.

"From my infancy I was particularly fond of reading, and all the money that came into my hands was laid out in the purchasing of books." "My father's little library consisted chiefly of books in polemic divinity, most of which I read." "There was another bookish lad in the town, John Collins by name, with whom I was intimately acquainted. We sometimes disputed, and very fond we were of argument, and very desirous of confuting one another." "I had caught this by reading my father's books of dispute on religion."

"While I was intent on improving my language, I met with an English Grammar, having at the end of it two little sketches on the arts of rhetoric and logic, the latter finishing with a dispute in the Socratic method." "I was charmed with it, adopted it, dropped my abrupt contradiction and positive argumentation, and put on the humble inquirer. And from reading Shaftesbury, and Collins having been made a doubter, as I already was in many points of our religious doctrines, I found this method the safest for myself, and very embarrassing to those against whom I used it."

"I was rather inclined to leave Boston, when I reflected that I had already made myself a little obnoxious to the governing party, and from the arbitrary proceedings of the Assembly in my brother's case. It was likely I might, if I staid, soon bring myself into scrapes; and further, that my *indiscreet* disputations about religion, began to make me pointed at with horror by good people as an infidel or atheist."

You here see the progress of his mind. He read his father's Calvinistic books and began to doubt the truth of most of the points in this system. He then read two infidel works, and began to doubt the truth of revelation. All this time you must remember that he was an uneducated printer's boy in Boston; and that his fondness for disputation acquired him the reputation of an unbeliever. We next find him in Philadelphia. These are his words.

"My chief acquaintance at this time were Charles Osborne, Joseph Watson, James Ralph; all lovers of reading. Watson was a pious, sensible young man of great integrity; the others rather more lax in their principles of religion, particularly Ralph, who, as well as Collins, had been unsettled by me; for which they both made me suffer."—*Life.*

Ralph and Franklin went to England. Ralph left a wife and one child, and Franklin was engaged to Miss Read. These are his words.

"For myself, I immediately got into work at Palmer's, a famous printing-house at Bartholomew-close, where I continued nearly a year. I was pretty diligent, but I spent with Ralph a good deal of my earnings in plays and public amusements. We had nearly consumed all my pistoles, and now just rubbed on from hand to mouth. He seemed quite to have forgotten his wife and child; and I by degrees my engagements with Miss Read, to whom I never wrote more than one letter, and that was to let her know I was not likely soon to return. This was another of the great errata of my life, which I could wish to correct, were I to live it over again."

"At Palmer's, I was composing for the second edition of Wollaston's Religion of Nature. Some of his reasonings not appearing to me well founded, I wrote a little metaphysical piece in which I made remarks on them. It was entitled a "Dissertation on Liberty and Necessity, Pleasure and Pain." I inscribed it to my friend Ralph; I printed a small number. My printing this pamphlet was another erratum."

Soon after this Ralph married a milliner, although he had a wife and child in America. He went into the country to keep school, and left her under the protection of Franklin. Let him state the rest of the affair.

"I grew fond of her company, and *being at that time under no religious restraint*, and taking advantage of my importance to her, I attempted to take some liberties with her, *another erratum*, which she refused with a proper degree of resentment."

We now find Franklin returned to Philadelphia, preparing to establish himself in business. Let us see what he now says of his infidelity.

"Before I enter upon my public appearance in business, it may be well to let you know the *then* state of my mind, with regard to my principles and morals, that you may see how far those influenced the future events of my life. My parents had early given me religious impressions, and brought me through my childhood piously in the dissenting way. But I was scarce fifteen when, after doubting by turns several points, as I found them disputed in the different books I read, I began to doubt of the revelation itself. Some books against Deism fell into my hands; they were said to be the substance of the sermons which had been preached at Boyle's Lectures. It happened that they wrought an effect on me quite contrary to what was intended by them. For the arguments of the Deists which were quoted to be refuted, appeared to me much stronger than the refutations; in short, I soon became a thorough Deist. My arguments *perverted* some others, particularly Collins and Ralph. But each of these having wronged me greatly without the least compunction, and recollecting Keith's conduct towards me, who was another free thinker, and my own towards Vernon and Miss Read, which at times gave me great trouble, *I began to suspect that this doctrine, though* it might be true, was not very useful.

"My London pamphlet appeared now not so clever a performance as I once thought it, and I doubted whether some error had not insinuated itself unperceived into my argument, so as to infect all that followed, as is common in metaphysical reasonings. I grew convinced that *truth, sincerity*, and integrity, in dealings between man and man, were of the utmost importance to the felicity of life; and I formed written resolutions which still remain in my journal book, to practise them ever while I lived. Revelation had indeed no weight with me as such; but I entertained an opinion, that though certain actions might not be bad, *because* they were forbidden by it, or because it commanded them; yet probably those actions might be forbidden because they were bad for us, or commanded *because* they were beneficial to us, in their own natures, all the circumstances of the things being considered. And this persuasion, with the kind hand of Providence, or some guardian angel, or accidental, favourable circumstances and situations, or all together, preserved me through this dangerous time of youth, and the hazardous situations I was sometimes in among strangers, remote from the eye and advice of my father, free from any *wilful*, gross immorality or injustice, that might have been *expected from my want of religion.*"

I should think this language must satisfy any unbeliever, that Franklin found that infidelity would not do to live by. I will give one more extract showing just how far he went in his unbelief.

"I had been religiously educated as a Presbyterian; but though some of the dogmas of that persuasion, such as the eternal decrees of God, election, reprobation, etc. appeared to me unintelligible, others doubtful; and I early absented myself from the public assemblies of the sect, Sunday being my studying day, I never was without some religious principles. I never doubted, for instance, the existence of a Deity; that he made the world and governs it by his Providence; that the most acceptable service of God was the doing good to man; that our souls are immortal; and that all crimes will be punished and virtue rewarded, either here or hereafter. These I esteemed the essentials of every religion, and being to be found in all the religions we had in the country, I respected them all, though with different degrees of respect, as I found them more or less mixed with other articles which, without any tendency to inspire, promote, or confirm morality, served principally to divide us, and make us unfriendly to one another. This respect to all, with the opinion that the worst had some good effects, induced me to avoid all discourse that might tend to lessen the good opinion another might have of his religion."

Here then you see an old man writing his early *life*. He speaks plainly and decidedly against infidelity, and calls all those errors which he should wish to avoid in another life. He leaves the impression all along that his sentiments while writing were Christian. This no honest man will deny. It may then be asked, on what ground he is claimed as an unbeliever? When R. D. Owen was called upon to prove that Franklin was an unbeliever, he advanced but one single passage, which I will now quote.

"Upon one of Whitefield's arrivals from England, at Boston, he wrote to me that he should soon come to Philadelphia, but knew not where he should lodge when there, as he understood his old friend and host, Mr. Benezet, was removed to Germantown. My answer was, You know my house; if you can make shift with its scanty accommodations, you will be most heartily welcome. He replied that if I made that offer for Christ's sake, I should not miss of a reward. And I returned, Dont let me be mistaken; it was not for Christ's sake, but for *your* sake."

Now what does all this prove? Simply that Franklin wished to have a joke with the *canting* Whitefield, and let him

know that he had sufficient respect for himself to give him his board, without doing it as a deed to the absent Christ. Truly, if you free inquirers can balance this against all the evidence I have presented, and say this outweighs all the passages quoted, your minds must be singularly constructed.

I have room for no further quotations, even if they were needed, as they are not. Now there are two sides to this question. Franklin was either a Christian or an infidel. I have produced enough of his own declarations to satisfy any one that he professed to hold Christian sentiments. If you still call him an unbeliever, you make him a hypocrite and a deceiver. Yes; there is no other ground. If then he was an infidel, he was a hypocrite and a deceiver; for he professed in public and private that he entertained Christian sentiments, and made others believe this. You are welcome to the man if this was his character, for every honest man must despise a hypocrite and deceiver. For my part, I believe he was a Christian, and, thus leave his character fair.

BERNARD WHITMAN.

Considerations for Philosophical Rejecters of the Christian Faith.

[Continued from page 536.]

2. IN the second place a dishonest will may appear in the examination of the Christian evidences when our faith is charged with evil influences and effects of which it has not been the source. There is an appearance of dishonesty at the outset. For how can there be either moral candour or philosophical exactness in testing the *truth* of Christianity by the character of its supposed influences and results. Let us for a moment yield the point to the infidel as to what those influences and results have in fact been. Because Christianity seems to me to have acted unfavourably upon man's temporal good, did therefore Christ not live? Because, as the pretence is, his instructions have made men superstitious, did he not therefore, by mighty works, prove his commission from God? Mere opinions as to what have been the *tendencies* of Christianity can no more overthrow the *facts* of Christianity, than the fact of the fall and decline of the Roman

Empire can be overthrown by opinions as to what have been the consequences of that decline and fall upon the world. It would seem the first question of an honest mind must be this;—Am I, or am I not, bound to receive the facts of Christianity as true? And the next question should be,—Do the *doctrines* of Christianity rest firmly upon these facts? These questions are to be tried upon their proper merits, with an honest consideration of the direct evidence in the case. If we find ourselves obliged, by every law of right reasoning, to answer these questions in the affirmative, it is dishonest evasion of the real point at issue, to cry out against the *truth* of Christianity because she has been the origin and cause of certain ill effects. If history proves Christianity to have come from God, we are bound to receive it as true, nor, while this is shown to be the case with regard to the origin of our religion, *can* a corrupt influence have been exerted by the religion itself.

We have another like dishonest evasion of the real question when the truth of Christianity is tested by the conduct of her professors. The argument must stand thus. Christianity is not true because Christians are not perfect men. Or, Christianity is not true because we have known many bad men who assumed to themselves the Christian name. How would this argument stand if turned against the objector? Infidelity is not true because infidels are not perfect men. Infidelity is not true because many infidels have been bad men. For, let it be observed, infidelity, as much as Christianity, is a system of belief. It is a system indeed without order or beauty. Its creed comprises articles most incongruous and most inconsistent with each other. Infidelity, indeed, while it rejects the Christian miracles, proposes to the understanding greater wonders, and exacts a faith more blind than does Christianity. The principle of faith takes its root in the very essence of the soul and cannot be torn from it. The infidel believes in eternity, but rejects an Eternal Spirit! He has full faith in immensity, but denies that there can be an Infinite God! Suppose, then, we should direct against infidelity itself the argument which the unbeliever urges against the Christian faith. Why, he would not have an inch of ground left him to stand upon while he should make his attack. But, in fact, this very argument, as used against Christianity by the unbeliever, developes the strength of the Christian cause. For it is the peculiar glory of the Christian faith that it does propose to man perfection as his only worthy aim. It requires and is

adapted to produce the greatest expansion of the soul, and the most harmonious development of all its powers,—it crushes sin in its origin and at its very seat in the heart,—it casts its forbidding look at the unjust purpose ere it is formed, and frowns down the evil disposition at the moment of the first faint consciousness of its existence. And, besides, can the infidel presume to deny that Christians have, in all ages of the church, been the purest and noblest portion of the human race? Will he refuse to acknowledge that the understanding, and reason, and conscience of the HUMAN RACE have received Christianity as true? Thus, even allowing that the argument against Christianity from the character of its professors, bears upon the case, it is an argument which, while it overthrows the very ground which the infidel occupies in presenting it, at the same time brings out to view the strength of the positions on which Christianity rests.

But, it may be asked, how can a person persuade himself actually to disbelieve Christianity by reasonings which he, at the outset, in his own heart knows do not tend to its disproof? In replying to this we must touch upon what has before been alluded to, the influence of the will upon belief. On every great subject there are many general courses of thought among which the mind has liberty to make its own choice. There are different points from which it may be viewed, and on either of these points the mind may place itself. We may propose to ourselves various questions in regard to the subject, and, as we please, consider these questions in either their affirmative or negative aspects. We may enter into an honest investigation of all the evidence bearing upon the inquiries we propose, or we may select from that evidence all that tends to further some *purpose* we have in view, and neglect the rest. We may occupy our attention and fill our whole mind with certain partial views which, considered by themselves, and habitually regarded as embracing everything important in the case, will furnish ample opportunity for the successful action of that purpose. Especially is there opportunity for all this process to take place in the mind when the subject of thought is not a question of mere abstract curiosity, but concerns some institution which has acted and is acting with immense power upon the interests of the human race, and is thus a subject of living interest to our own hearts. The institution may be one which pretends to discuss and decide questions relating to the whole happiness and duty of my immortal soul. It may be an institution that has firmly established

itself among men,—it may have closely entwined itself with every other institution,—it may exert its influence upon every other interest of men, and, from the seat of its power, extend itself in every direction over the surface of the globe. This institution calls for my affection and service. The call excites in me a lively interest. My pulse quickens with emotion. The question immediately arises,—What shall I do? And that question conscience answers. Examine the claims that are presented, and if you find them just, your affection and service you must not fail to render. Gladly I obey the direction. But, anon, I find that this institution rebukes some of my habitual practices and opposes some of my cherished desires. Conscience had done the same thing before, but, instead of hushing the passions to listen to her quiet remonstrance, I had encouraged their tumult, and increased their power by giving my ear to the syren voices of temptation from without. And now again, strengthening her before timid voice, in the same strain, but with a louder tone, she commands me to submit to the rebuke and still conduct my examination with candour. Here is the very point for the formation of honest or dishonest purpose. Here is the hinge on which turns the question of my acceptance or rejection of the claims presented. Perhaps I may decide to obey the direction of duty, and if so, all will be well. No man ever put his trust in conscience to meet with eventual disappointment! Perhaps I may decide to set passion above conscience, and, exercising that power we all have of forming a dishonest resolution, refuse to view in clear light and with an open eye those claims which run so counter to my desires. The mind thus made up, my great objects thenceforward are, to seek for every excuse that can justify my purpose, to raise every possible presumption against the claims I am resolved to reject, to shut out from view every consideration that goes to confirm those claims,—in short, I most laboriously endeavour to deceive and ruin my own soul. How long can such a course be persisted in,—a course which so tends to spoil all candour of thought and honesty of purpose,—how long can it be persisted in before the mind is filled with objections to that which the heart wishes to reject, and the intellect is very well satisfied that the heart is right. O the awful power of the will! We are sometimes told that we have no power over ourselves, that we are tossed upon every wave of outward influence that may chance to roll by us, and that we may as well submit passively to move in the direction in which any

accident may impel us. But simply passive beings we are not. Active we must be in our own exaltation or ruin. Everyone will perceive the tendency of these remarks to illustrate the manner in which we may treat the great question,—Shall I receive, or shall I reject the Christian faith?

I have thus far spoken of one of the ways in which, under the general point I am endeavouring to illustrate, a dishonest will may appear in the examination of the evidences of Christianity. Such a will may appear in our putting out of view the direct testimony on which the truth of our religion rests, and testing the truth of this religion entirely by the character of its supposed influences, or of its formal professors. I have endeavoured also to describe the process by which disbelief is brought about under the influence of principles which, at first, we know to be false.

Let us now for a moment waive all that we have said on the first topic, and admit it to be right that the truth of Christianity should be made to depend upon the character of its supposed results. Even on this supposition, there is, in the examination of the claims of Christianity, yet another case of dishonesty which calls for illustration. We maintain that a dishonest will may appear in charging upon Christianity evil results of which she is not the source. Our religion was intended and adapted to act with great power upon the human soul, to pierce into its most secret depths, to become woven into its very texture. As it did in fact seize with a strong grasp on the human soul, it became at length closely united with all human interests and institutions. But these human interests and institutions were not completely and suddenly sanctified by the influence of Christianity,—and what wonder that in the ceaseless commotion of these interests, and in the progress of these institutions, evils should result similar to those of which the world had already had bitter experience? Now is it logical or honest to ascribe to every influence that has blended itself with these institutions and interests a portion of all the evil results that have flowed from their ever-changing action? Let such reasoning be universally adopted, and where would it lead us? In thousands of cases the very thing, whose influence it would prove injurious, has done much to mitigate evil consequences which could not be entirely prevented. It would prove a man to be partaker in the crime whose commission he had used all his power of sympathy and persuasion to prevent. As well might Howard be classed with the wretched inmates of the prisons he visited,

as Christianity be confounded with the evil influences which have surrounded her since she came into the world. The argument, that Christianity is an immense evil simply because it has been connected with immense evils in the history of our race, amounts to this, that Christianity has had a bad influence because it has been unable to sanctify the world in a moment. We should be ashamed thus to urge an idea whose opposite is so manifestly absurd did not much of the infidel's logic against Christianity require it. Besides, our religion *is* so interwoven with the miseries of the human race that we can easily conceive with what readiness a dishonest will would affirm that it has produced those miseries.

We shall conclude our present remarks by considering more particularly one of the pretences which the infidel sets forth relative to the point of which we have been speaking.

It is maintained by the infidel that the Christian religion has stopped the progress of the human race, and kept back the soul from its perfection. Look then, we would say to the unbeliever, at the world as it was when Christ came, and compare it with the world as it is now. Or make the comparison between different portions of the human race in its present condition. Compare Heathendom with Christendom. Can you honestly say that the world received a downward impulse at the advent of Christ, and has ever since been on the decline? Or do you really believe that man's nature is realizing its perfection in the bosom of the Asiatic continent, or on the desert of Zahara? But, you say, man has improved, not by the aid of Christianity, but in spite of the superstition which Christianity has fixed upon his soul. Is this assertion made from an ignorant mind or a dishonest heart? Look again at the human race, as it was when Christ came to it with the message of the Father's love, and look at that monster superstition, which, as you pretend, was brought into the world by Christianity, and which, from the infusions of Christianity has received its deadly strength and poisonous venom. What, in a religious point of view, were the elements which Christianity, at its first introduction, found already at work in the human mind? Did she find men in their own eyes, a race of mere animal beings, contented with a pure sensual philosophy, troubled with no superstitious fancies, looking upon nature as the great All in All, not even dreaming of a Maker and Ruler of the Universe, or of the reality of a spiritual power and excellence beyond the reach of their bodily vision? Precisely the contrary of all this. Is it pos-

sible that, with the eyes open and the mind disposed to sincerity, you can deny that Christianity found man *possessed of a religious nature?* Look at the multitude of deities with which even the material world was swarming, and then ask yourself if you can honestly deny that man's nature, whencesoever it came, was, at that time, disposed to adoration. But, you say, political men ruled the minds of the multitude and gave them this direction. But, because man's religious nature was used for political purposes, did therefore political designs create that nature? But, you may pretend, philosophers, though they saw the folly of superstition, found it for their *interest* to keep it alive in the minds which they wished to control for their own selfish ends. How came it then that the philosophers more deeply than any others felt the power of the same superstition in their own souls? Besides, what foundation did they discover in the common mind on which to build this broad and gloomy structure of superstitious observances and fears. But, you may inquire, was not all this religion but a magnificent piece of hypocrisy which the whole human race had taken upon itself to enact? Alas, to what extremities will your pretended disbelief in man's religious nature drive you? How does this inquiry suppose the falsehood of that testimony which is borne to us by all histories from all ages! But, supposing there was a place for the inquiry, you might be asked, where and what was the *reality* corresponding to this stupendous hypocrisy of the human heart. For all hypocrisy implies something real as its subject. I cannot pretend to possess a character of which no *idea* has entered my mind.

We will ask you to look at those portions of the world which the beams of Christianity have never touched and see if you do not find man a religious being there. See if you do not find him a religious being where even if philosophers could make him such, no philosophers exist, and where the rude simplicity of savage life precludes the idea that religious systems have been built on the basis of political intrigue. Look, for instance, at the accounts given by the missionaries to Polynesia concerning the degraded islanders whom they laboured to convert. "Religion mixed in all the occupations and amusements of the Polynesians, and its rites were interwoven with every act of their lives; but it was a religion that debased instead of humanizing.—There were gods of peace, several gods of war, the god of the ocean, the god of accidents, and the god of idiots,—for they believed that all

idiots were inspired.—Besides their divinities, the creative fancy of the Polynesians peopled their lovely isles with ethereal existences, who, like our fairies, sported in the moonbeams, and held their revels in the loveliest dells, and by the sweetest streamlets; or, emulating the dim visions of the Gael, robed themselves in the mountain mists, shone in the pale meteor's flame, and mantled amid the howling of the midnight storm."*

This may be laughed at and called superstition—and superstition it is. But superstition itself proves man's religious nature. For what *is* superstition but a wrong and perverse development of that nature? Those faculties in the soul which are the source of superstition cannot be annihilated,—the superstition must be corrected by their being trained aright.

The Gospel found the Jews a peculiar people,—why it so found them, it does not sufficiently bear on our present purpose to inquire. So it was. They were a nation by themselves, and with them the religious nature was in a peculiar condition. But, as we have already said, religion existed in some state, the religious nature of man was developed in some sense, all over the world. The question is, has Christianity retarded the perfection of man? And this question is in great measure answered when we ascertain whether it has had a happy influence on that religious principle which inheres in his very constitution and which, taken away, he would be a being of entirely different character. Let us then consider what influence Christianity exerted upon two things,—the Gentile philosophy and the Jewish religion. We say the Gentile philosophy,—for that exhibited all the attainments even of a religious nature which man's unaided powers had been able to make.

Let it be observed the discussion proceeds now on the supposition, whose truth cannot be denied, that man is a religious, or, as the infidel may express it, a superstitious being. Adoration he will pay,—forms of worship he will have. He is made essentially religious, and he can no more forsake his religious than he can his intellectual constitution. The great question then is,—has man, as a religious being, been benefited by Christianity.

What, then, before the advent of Christ, was the culture which Gentile philosophy gave to the religious nature of man?

* "Progress of the Gospel in Polynesia."

The best of which it was susceptible? The question need not be answered. Who does not know that Gentile philosophy utterly failed to satisfy man's religious wants, and that, before Christ came, it was fast perverting his religious nature? Philosophy made religion a thing of metaphysical inquiries and scholastic distinctions, a thing for learned and acute minds, rather than the fountain of life and joy to the whole human race. It had taken it away from the warmth and action of real life, and removed it to the thin and cold atmosphere of wordy abstractions. It made it to consist in a set of dogmas for ceaseless intellectual contention, rather than in a system of life-giving truth, warming the affections and claiming the service of the heart. And, while Gentile philosophy thus gave a perverted development to the religious nature, it gave a wrong action to the intellectual powers. And why? Because, the religious nature being perverted, the harmony of the whole mental constitution was destroyed. The whole mind lost its balance and proportion. The religious nature lost its right action on the understanding, the understanding refused to be the servant of the soul. The human mind, becoming more and more disjoined in itself, exhibited itself in more and more monstrous developments, and thus the soul, instead of being led on under the influences of Gentile philosophy nearer and nearer to its perfection, by the disproportionate development of its powers, was filled with perpetual strife and discord. But Christianity comes and casts in its influence upon the elements that were thus darkly and restlessly struggling with each other. And what *was* its influence? Let history reply. Let her compare for us the philosophy of Christian with the philosophy of Gentile minds. Will the comparison justify the unbeliever's pretence that Christianity has kept the human mind back from its perfection?—or will it prove that pretence to have come either from dishonesty or ignorance?

Again, what was the effect of Christianity on the religion of the Jews? Did it, by its influence on that religion, keep the human mind back from its perfection? Was the Jewish nation suddenly arrested by the hand of Christ in an onward and upward path of glory? Christ found the Jews far before all others in their ideas concerning religion. We do not see how even the infidel can deny this. But he found them narrowing down religion more and more to a round of ceremonies and forms, removing it from its proper seat in the heart, and allowing it to preside only over the external man. He found them exhibiting in many things the greatest superstition,—and su-

perstition results from a perverse development of the religious nature. Did Christ increase the evil? Did he make the Jews more superstitious, more hypocritical, more trifling, more heartless in their religious faith and practice? Or did his religion purify everything that it touched, turning even corruption into life, establishing itself in the heart of man, and going forth to destroy the wickedness of his hands? Did it not change the lifeless form into the living reality, the hypocritical service into the worship of sincerity and truth, the form of godliness into its power, and the agonies of superstition into the hope and joy of a reasonable faith? If it did, what becomes of the assertion that Christianity has kept the soul of man back from its perfection? Must it not come from dishonesty or from ignorance?

Christianity has then freed Gentilism from idolatrous worship, and false philosophy and Judaism from the hypocrisy and superstition that had corrupted its religious faith. The unbeliever says that Christianity has filled the world with superstition. Christianity, considered as an abstract system of faith and morals, has not the slightest tinge of superstition. It is as clear as sunlight, and, by the reasonableness of its statements and requisitions, it has commended itself, not only to the greatest minds the world has seen, but to minds the most scrutinizing and naturally the most cautious and skeptical. But, admitting for a moment the truth of the statement whose falsity we assert, suppose that superstition has sometimes flowed from Christianity as its source, and not invariably from those perversions of the religious nature which have been caused by the false religions and bad passions of the human race. Even with this concession, we should maintain that the superstition which Christianity has destroyed or prevented is infinitely worse and infinitely greater in amount than the superstition to which she has given life. But the influence of Christianity, so far as it has in truth been the influence of Christianity, and not of human additions to the teachings of Christ and his holy Apostles, has always been to save men from superstition. Had Christ not come, it is morally certain that the whole world would even now be tyrannized over by a merciless superstition that would crush the religious nature, and with it the happiness and glory of man, in its unrelaxing grasp. Christianity was absolutely necessary to save the soul of man from a monstrous development of its faculties, and to introduce harmony and beauty into its growth. Thus she has not only bestowed upon him the richest blessings he could

enjoy, but saved him from the deepest miseries he could endure,—blessings that crown this life as well as the future,—and miseries which, so far as human foresight can discover, and wherever the soul might exist, would not have ceased to embitter the waters of life;—and thus even the infidel and the atheist have cause, if they would open their eyes to see it, cause in every circumstance of happiness for which they are indebted to the institutions of society, to the improvement of the human mind,—nay, or to any intellectual advances they themselves have been enabled to make, to let their souls overflow with devout thankfulness to God for the mission of Jesus Christ. The Christian faith, wherever it has come, has taken away that ignorant terror on all the great subjects of death, judgment, the spiritual world, man's immortality, which in all ages has poured forth its dark floods of superstition over the benighted regions of the earth. Even now Christianity is anxiously and affectionately labouring to put away from the earth the superstition of infidelity. For even infidelity has its religion and its adoration. Its creed contains mysteries greater than any that ever claimed celestial origin, and it has an adoration as blind and senseless as that of the heathen idolater. It must subject the principle of faith to a severer torture than can be inflicted by any form of Christianity, however corrupted by superstition. We would beseech the unbeliever to come to a more *reasonable faith.* We would say to him,—faith in God is better than faith in Nature as God. Faith in a Creator is better than faith in an uncreated world. Faith in the spiritual world is better than faith in the powers and combinations of matter. Faith in the immortality of the soul is better than faith in its annihilation. Faith in another life can alone enable us to enjoy the happiness, to perform the duties, and to finish the work of this. C. A. B.

---

*On the Characteristics of St. John's Gospel.**

THE most striking peculiarity in the Gospel of St. John and that which will be found to comprehend and explain nearly all the others, is the manner in which he proves the

* The views which are offered in the following dissertation are taken principally from a work of Herder on the same subject.

Messiahship and Divine character of our Saviour. This point,—to establish which must have been the ultimate design of all the Evangelists, whatever means each one might judge best adapted to the wants of those for whom he wrote,—the author of the fourth Gospel endeavours to deduce from the very nature of Christianity, the purity and sublimity of its doctrines. From the pursuance of this plan appear to have arisen all those peculiarities which distinguish St. John's Gospel from those of the other Evangelists. He has omitted many things which they record, such as the nativity, genealogy, ordinances, and most of the miracles of our Saviour: he has recorded too, many things which they omit. These omissions on the one hand, and these additions on the other, prove indeed, the truth of Eichhorn's supposition, that St. John must have been acquainted with, and have presupposed the existence of, some other Gospel, and that in many instances he has supplied deficiences in the narrative parts of that Gospel. But still, this hypothesis will not account for all his peculiarities. To supply those circumstances in the life of our Saviour which his predecessors had omitted, could be, after all, but a secondary object with a writer like John. It surely was not his intention merely to gather the fragments which others had left, to furnish limbs for the *Torso* (the body) of the Jewish Gospel. The original and finished character of his work, planned as it is with systematic exactness, and executed with measured regularity, forbids this supposition: he himself disclaims it where he tells us, "And many other signs truly, did Jesus in the presence of his disciples which are not written in this book": and again, "There are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written everyone, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written." This strong hyperbole with which his work closes, as it asserts the uselessness of the undertaking, so it proves, that to supply deficiencies in the narrative of the other Gospels, was not the sole intention of our Evangelist.

The true design of this Gospel will, I think, appear from a comparison of its peculiarities with the wants which must have been felt at that time, by the converts out of Palestine, and which the Jewish Gospel left unsatisfied. The historical collection, which the first three Evangelists made use of, had been prepared in the earliest age of Christianity, at Jerusalem, and for native Jews. It was therefore contrived to meet views which were confined to that age and place; it was

obliged to conform, in some measure, to the expectations which Judea had formed of her Messiah, and to produce those tokens, collected from the prophets, without which she refused to recognise him. But in the mean time Christianity had extended beyond the limits of Palestine, and speculations concerning it had arisen which were modified according to the conceptions of the different nations who embraced it. What the Jews of Palestine deemed indispensable had become of little importance to those of Asia Minor, and was altogether rejected by the heathens. The Gentile converts had, of course, no relish for the ideal of the Jewish Messiah; they were involved in mystical notions and abstruse speculations of their own: and at the time when a single Greek word, composed of the initials of these five—*Ἰησους Χριστος, Θεου υἱος, σωτηρ*—(Jesus Christ, the son of God, the Saviour,) was to the Apostles the symbol of all Christianity, and did in fact contain all that they preached, disputes and theories concerning the how and the when, had sprung up among the philosophers of the the east and the south. They endeavoured to trace to some remote origin the connection between God and the Saviour, to reconcile his religion with their philosophy, and thus continued to involve that simple formula in doubts and mysteries, till the white robe of Christianity whose purity had been so carefully preserved by the Apostles, became in the hands of those sectarians a coat of many colours. It was then that St. John, the companion and favourite of our Saviour, the best qualified, and at that time probably the only living original witness of all the miracles, wrote his Gospel: it was therefore that he gave the brief but comprehensive theory we find at the beginning of his work, not to combat the systems of the Gnostic philosophers, of Cerinthus, of Saturnius, or of Basilides, but simply to explain, according to the principles of the Hellenists, by the use of the term "*Λογος*," the "*Πνεύμα του Θεου*" of the Jews, and thus to render all further speculations superfluous. He did not contradict what had been said in the Gospel of Palestine; the authority of that Gospel was still to continue; it was of apostolic origin and contained the oldest views of Christianity; it was his intention to explain, confirm, and render it universally practical. That this was his purpose, the author declares himself where he tells us—"But these things are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the son of God, and that, believing, ye might have life through his name." And with this purpose in view the

characteristic peculiarities of his Gospel may be easily explained. For instance;—the Jewish Gospel found, among other tokens by which the Messiah was to be recognised, this,—that he should be a descendant of David, born at Bethlehem. Accordingly two of our Evangelists have preserved records which trace his lineage up to that distinguished ancestor. Of this pedigree John makes no account: he considered the only practical part of the evangelical history as commencing with our Saviour's baptism. Of what use too, after the destruction of Jerusalem and the dispersion of the Jews, could this genealogy be to the foreign nations for whom he wrote, and who prided themselves upon the names of their own ancestors? In his Gospel therefore, no mention is made of the lustre derived by Christ from the fame of his progenitors,—he is simply the son of Joseph and Mary, and as far as nationality was concerned,—not a Jew, but the Saviour of the world. Again, the original Gospel, in speaking of our Saviour's miracles, conforms to the views of the people for whom it was intended; it gives a great number and many that are similar in their nature. For the Jews, according to a narrow interpretation of their prophet Isaiah, considered miracles as the chief token of the Messiah, so that St. Paul makes it a distinguishing point between this people and the Greeks, that "the Jews require a sign and the Greeks seek after wisdom." From St. John's omission of most of the miracles of our Saviour, therefore, we are not, I think, authorized to infer with Eichhorn, that miracles did not form a part of his idea of the Messiah, but rather to seek an explanation in the design with which this Evangelist wrote. With the people of Asia Minor, Africa, Greece, and other countries beyond Palestine, the miracles of Jesus had of course only the weight of distant and past wonders,—a long catalogue of them was of little use; he who could heal one diseased, and restore one dead to life, could, in the same manner, cure and resuscitate thousands. The miracles which St. John brings are few therefore, but striking and well attested. They are generally introduced as the occasions of some important discourse or remark of our Saviour, and are mentioned not so much for their own individual value, but as symbols of one continuing, permanent miracle.

On the same principles we may account for most of the other omissions and additions which distinguish this Gospel. Some of them indeed require particular explanations, but these are also obvious. St. John, for instance, takes no notice of his Master's transfiguration on the mount. This is

because the design of that miracle was merely temporary. He dwells particularly on the discourses which our Saviour held at Jerusalem. This is probably to meet the insinuation which might be made, that the Teacher of men had confined himself to an obscure corner of the country and to the most ignorant part of the people. When he omits to mention the ordinances which Jesus appointed and the form of prayer which he gave, it is, no doubt, because the general adoption of these among the converts to Christianity had rendered it unnecessary. But a consideration of all these particulars, as well as an examination of the peculiarities in the language and style of our Evangelist, would far exceed the limits of this essay.

Above all then, be it observed, that the evidences which the fourth Gospel brings for the Messiahship of Jesus are founded upon his doctrines and discourses. It was the author's design to place the character and office of the Messiah in a clear light, to show what was meant by the Son of God, and in what sense he is to be considered as the Saviour of the world. "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness," says our Saviour in the Gospel of St. John, "even so must the Son of Man be lifted up." And thus indeed did this Apostle hold up the image of the Messiah, not to the eyes of the Jewish nation only, but to the view of the whole world, that all who looked upon it might be saved.

F. H. Hedge.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Counsels to Young Men on Modern Infidelity, and the Evidences of Christianity. By John Morison, D.D.—*author of an Exposition of the Book of Psalms, &c.* Boston, James Loring. 12mo. pp. 237. 1834.

This work, though not marked by any originality of view, is pervaded by a spiritual fervour that warmly recommends it to the heart. The author seems to be a man who has not only assured himself of the *external* and *historical* truth of the Christian

religion, but has also verified the convictions of his understanding in the experience of his heart. Every Christian, who has made great spiritual progress, must have enjoyed the peculiar delight which results from what may be called the second establishment of the claims of our faith,—that proof which, after the religion is seen to stand firm on the foundations of human testimony and the history of the world, is found in the principles and affections of the spiritual nature. This internal voice which, in gentle but distinct tones, sounds up from the depths of the heart, and speaks of the accordance there is between the teachings of Jesus and the best powers and noblest aspirations of the soul,—this is the voice which persuades us, with a grasp that nothing in life and nothing in death can relax, to cling to the hope set before us in the Gospel. After the intellect has done its part in persuading us to the belief and practice of Christianity, and we, having honestly guided it in its examination, faithfully submit to its just conclusions, the heart, with its own powerful and irresistible logic, comes in to bind us with new closeness to that service of God which is perfect freedom.

We express ourselves thus in order to apply our remarks as a commendation of that feature of the work before us in which the author manifests his strong internal sense of the value of Christianity, and in which he does much, as we think, to infuse the same sense into the hearts of his readers. Christianity is to be loved as well as believed, and she asks for that peculiar kind of belief which results from love. She is to be known with that knowledge of the affections and the soul of which she continually speaks.

But let us show what we mean in our author's own words.

"The man who is a genuine believer is as fully conscious, as he is of existence, that Christianity is no cunningly devised fable. It has established its throne in the deep-seated convictions of his heart. He has felt the transformation it has wrought; "old things are passed away; behold all things are become new." His entire character has been favourably affected by it. Upon his once gloomy path it has shed the light of immortality; it has taught him to "rejoice even in tribulation;" it has changed all the aspects of life, by throwing over them the hues of eternity; it has conferred on him a reality of happiness which the whole creation had no power of imparting. In his own person he beholds a monument of the truth and excellence of Christianity; which forever forbids him to doubt. By other evidences, indeed, his character is confirmed; but in his peace of mind, in that "hope which is full of immortality," and in the heavenward bearing of his once earthly character, he is enabled to feel that Christianity is no 'cunningly devised fable.' "—pp. 65, 66.

That the intrinsic moral beauty of Christianity should be thus set forth to young minds, and for such this work is intended, seems to us of great importance. We deem it important because

it does that which nothing else can do and which is especially important to be done. We may give a young person instruction upon intellectual points, and furnish his mind with a great many *ideas* on religious subjects, and yet produce but a very inconsiderable and unworthy development of his religious nature. And it is the *expansion of his soul* which is needed, rather than the *information of his intellect;*—indeed the latter is of great value no farther than it is connected with the former. If we can make a child's heart glow with piety to God, and benevolence to his fellow-children, it is far better than if we should delight his eager curiosity by showing unto him all mysteries and all knowledge.

The religious instructor, who is satisfied because his pupil can freely repeat chapters from the Bible, can hardly have for himself any distinct idea of that process of growth which takes place in the immortal nature when the spirit of truth has been infused into it and is quickening it in every part. And we shall far better guard the young man against the specious objections of the infidel, as well as give him a far more rapid progress towards the world of spiritual life and joy, by persuading him to take unto himself the shield of faith, the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the spirit, than by carrying him through a long and laborious process of training as to those external supports of Christianity which are of an inferior and incidental character, and informing him of all the battles, small and great, which, in the history of the church and of infidelity, have been fought around those supports.

The trait we have remarked upon as distinguishing the book before us appears again in the remarks made upon the character of Christ, the description of which he concludes in the following strain.

"Whence such a character as this? Was it from earth or heaven? If from earth, where can we look for its great *archetype?* Not surely in the Gentile world; for it infinitely surpassed the *ideal* models which were laid down by the purest and most enlightened of its philosophers. Not in the Jewish world, for even its most cherished patriarchs were chargeable with innumerable imperfections; and in the days of Jesus of Nazareth, the great body of the nations were peculiarly degraded, both as it respected the acquirements of the understanding, and the habits of the life and conduct. Whence, then, this mysterious and wonderful personage,—this Being so unlike all the generations of men who had preceded him or who have followed after him, yet clothed in a human form, possessed of human sympathies, and subject to human woes? No wonder that Rousseau, in his exquisite and well-known contrast between Socrates and Christ, should feel himself constrained to remark, that 'the inventor of such a personage would be a more astonishing character than the hero.'" pp. 70, 71.

Although we admire the sentiments with which our author speaks of Christianity, we cannot approve of the indiscriminating severity with which he speaks of the infidel. There is a bitterness in some of his remarks which, even were it deserved by *all* infidels, as, at the hazard, perhaps, in these intemperate and intolerant times of being called apologists for infidelity, we think it is not, we are most thoroughly persuaded that it is not calculated to reclaim the unbeliever from the error of his thoughts, or the error of his ways. When shall we be persuaded that, in raising men from earth to heaven, that course is not most successful which tends to stir up the bad passions of a bad heart!

Our author needlessly draws in at the close of his work a treatise on the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, in which he supports, in the most rigid form, the doctrine of their *verbal* inspiration. His arguments appear to us to be of a very *verbal* kind. In commenting on that passage, in which Christ charges those who reject him with not having the word of God abiding in them, he speaks as follows.

"Here several things are to be noticed. In the first place, the Scriptures of the Jews, which did not abide in them through their unbelief are distinctly recognised as *the word of God.*
* * * In the third place they are spoken of emphatically as *the writings*, evidently including them all, and leaving no room to dispute the divine origin of their diction any more than of the doctrines they contained"!

Again, in proof of the verbal inspiration of the prophecies he quotes the passage—"Holy men *spake* as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." He accounts for the difference of style in the different books of Scripture, by saying that "the Spirit of God was as capable of influencing the mind of a prophet or an apostle in coincidence with his own tastes, predilections, and education, as in opposition to them." A defence of the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures, consisting of such arguments, may, we trust, be safely left to itself. If the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures were necessary to the purposes of faith and worship, alas for the world. If the inspired words make an essential part of the Holy Book, the Bible is every day and moment slipping farther and farther from our grasp.

If this book should fall into the hands of any unbeliever, we would beseech him deeply to consider the nature of that internal argument for Christianity which it sets forth, that argument which, were no other argument within our reach, would still make Christianity the religion of the greatest, the wisest, and the holiest of our race. C. A. B.

Letters to the Young. *By* MARIA JANE JEWSBURY. From the third London edition. Perkins, Marvin, & Co., Boston. 1834. pp. 264.

WE should think the authoress of these Letters is not the mere copyist of what others have said and written. She pours out her sentiments and thoughts with a freshness and force which indicate that they have been fully realized in her own mind and heart. The style is marked by naturalness and simplicity, and not unfrequently, and seemingly without the slightest effort, it rises to eloquence. Little turns of beautiful and original expression sometimes occur, which strike the mind as no mean proofs that we are reading the work of a thinker. Our authoress seems to have felt in her own heart the matchless excellence of the gospel and the supreme power of the love of Christ. We have been particularly pleased with those letters in which she endeavours to impress her young friends with a true sense of the value of the Holy Scriptures. Had we space we should be glad to quote from these letters. And indeed we cannot refuse to make a short extract from the sixth letter in which we find a just thought uttered with all the unction of true feeling.

"God, my dear friends, is as sufficient to satisfy the heart, as he is worthy to occupy the mind. It is good to be laid upon a sick bed (if he bless it)—to see the vanity of even the world's best and fairest. What is poetry to the languid ear? What are pictures to the aching eye? or praise, or music, or gaiety, to the sick and sinking heart? Where is the mind itself with all its boasted resources? Yet when the thoughts are confused and the fancy fevered,—the judgment weakened and the memory faithless,—even then the words which God speaks in his Gospel are spirit and life. Just where the world leaves us, he takes us up."—pp. 79, 80.

We could not help being reminded by this passage of one of our own dear friends now afflicted with disease, for whose sickness we have wept much, and for whose recovery we have often prayed. We could not help thinking of a striking remark he made to us as to the source of his consolation in the pains of his body and the weakness of his mind. At times, (he said), a rich text from the glorious Gospel will float through my mind all day, and come and go like the joyful strains of some rich melody which has long been familiar to the heart. What a reward even on earth for making the Bible one's study and delight!

In these Letters, familiar as they are, we sometimes meet with a thought of great importance. Take the following for an example.

"Minds of a reflective and somewhat timid cast are most liable to the influence of morbid sensibility; they soon begin to look through

rather than upon society, and consequently become disgusted with the construction of it. They serve their pleasures as children do their toys—pull them to pieces in order to ascertain their internal mechanism; and their emotions as the same children serve their rose-buds—open them to accelerate their time of bloom. Without intentional want of benevolence, they feel little towards their fellow-creatures beyond general good-will, or perfect indifference, whilst their affections are few, ardent, arbitrary, and exclusive."

With the *technical* theology embodied in these Letters we cannot agree, and we sometimes find what we esteem errors expressed in their grossest form. We did hope and trust that ideas like that expressed in the following couplet, quoted by our authoress, were passing out of approbation and use.

> "For God before, man like himself did frame,
> But God himself now like mortal man became."

Would that the writer could have considered what she meant before she transcribed these lines. The thought contained in them to which we allude is too shocking for criticism.

CORRESPONDENCE AND INTELLIGENCE.

SIXTH LETTER TO REV. ADIN BALLOU.

Harvard, November 17, 1834.

Dear Sir,

I now proceed to make some remarks on the following passage contained in your letter:—

"Finally, dear brother, pardon me for alluding to a practice in your denomination, which is as offensive to me, as the one I have been vindicating is to you. I mean the almost perpetual attention which your ministers and writers pay to their distinguishing doctrine of the divine Unity. I am a Unitarian. I was never any thing else. I drew my Unitarianism out of the Bible before I ever heard of Trinitarianism. It has always remained with me. I value the doctrine for what I deem its self-consistency and agreement with divine revelation. But to imagine it a doctrine necessary to be laboured over and over, year after year, in almost every sermon, periodical, and tract, I am no more able, than to imagine how Trinitarians contrive to make a belief in the Trinity the mainspring of vital religion."

If it is a fact that our ministers and writers pay "almost perpetual attention to the doctrine of the divine Unity," and if this "doctrine is laboured over and over, year after year, in almost every sermon, periodical, and tract;" I must confess it is a fact I was not acquainted with; and were I to form a judgment in regard to this thing from what I have read, observed, and heard, it would differ considerably from yours. For these twenty years past I have been generally connected with Unitarian

societies, and more than eight years of this time I have been a hearer. I have heard many Unitarians preach, and a great many Unitarian sermons; *i. e.* sermons which inculcated Unitarian views of the gospel. And I cannot now recollect a single sermon among them all, in which our distinguishing doctrine was the theme or burden of the discourse! To be more particular, I do not recollect that I have ever heard a sermon, the apparent object of which was to disprove the doctrine of the Trinity, or of the equality of the Son to the Father, or of the two natures of Christ, or of his preëxistence, or of the personality of the Holy Spirit. Others may have heard these subjects frequently discussed in the pulpit, but I have not. I can easily call to mind a great many sermons which I have heard delivered by Unitarian clergymen, and if they have, in my presence, dwelt on these controverted doctrines just alluded to, I do not now remember it. I would not say that I never heard a sermon on these topics; but if I have, it now escapes my recollection. You know that the Orthodox generally bring very different charges against us. They charge us with keeping back our peculiar doctrines. They complain of our sermons, that they do not go far enough: they frequently call our discourses "moral essays": they object that we dwell too much on duties, virtues, and human ability. You know what language they use, and I need not repeat it here.

I do not mean to insinuate that we have been silent at all times and in all places about the Trinity. We regard it not as a trifling error, and we are prompt to embrace proper opportunities to correct it. But this is only one among many errors which we are earnestly labouring to correct.

If you examine our periodicals of these last twenty years, you will find that our writers have paid no small share of attention to many other subjects besides the doctrine of the Trinity and the Divine Unity. I refer you to the "Christian Disciple," "Christian Examiner," "Unitarian Miscellany," "Sparks' Tracts," "The Liberal Preacher," "Unitarian Advocate," "Scriptural Interpreter," and "Christian Register"—and also to "The Unitarian," the death of whose editor was so eloquently and feelingly announced in your last paper. Our common and deeply lamented friend was the open, the earnest, the active friend to Unitarian Christianity. But the pages of "The Unitarian," as well as his other writings, will show that he was labouring not baesly to check and destroy the influeuce of a single error, nor to establish a single truth. Trinitarianism was not the only object which he boldly and often opposed. He did not employ all his time and energies in attempts to establish the doctrine of the Divine Unity. He contended with Calvinism, with Universalism, with Infidelity, with Atheism. It was his desire and endeavour to render this work highly useful to the cause of practical religion. But I need not remind you of these things.

If you will read the publications mentioned above, I think you will own that our writers have not confined their attention to that article of faith from which they have taken their distinctive name. They have sought to give mankind juster views of religion and of divine revelation generally. They believed that wrong notions were entertained by many of their Christian brethren, not only in regard to the Trinity, but also in regard to native depravity, election, reprobation, the divine decrees, the divine sovereignty, the atonement, regeneration, faith, good works, the condition of those who die in infancy, the true evidences of a Christian character and hope, &c. &c. They have been busy also in pleading the cause of charity, peace, temperance, benevolence. In their studies they have thought of Sunday-schools, of the inmates of prisons and hospitals, of the sailor, of the slave, of the poor and afflicted. They have laboured much to check the progress of infidelity.

And if you consult the other publications of Unitarians, I think you will observe the same wide range of thought and the same large and com-

prehensive design. I refer you to the writings of Fox, Cappe, Channing, Buckminster, Thacher, Ware, Palfrey, Greenwood, Colman. They will tell you that they had aimed to do something more than to refute the Trinitarian error, and assert and defend the Divine Unity. Noah Worcester has written much relating to the Trinity. But remove from his writings every sentence which relates immediately to that or the opposite doctrine, and have we nothing left to speak for the warm heart and fruitful mind of this distinguished man, this aged and devoted servant of God?

As to our Tracts, it might be expected that our distinguishing doctrine, and the one which is opposed to it, would, in some form or other, be often brought into view; and we have a considerable number of tracts devoted wholly or partly to an explanation and defence of our views of God and of Christ. This seemed necessary in order to meet the various and varying wants of the people. But after all, I believe there is but a comparatively small number of our tracts which treat chiefly on this subject. I have now by me a list of the titles of forty-nine tracts of the first, and ten of the second series, which have been published by the American Unitarian Association. I need not copy these titles to show you their variety of topics. You can easily examine them for yourself, and also those of the many tracts which have been published since. And when you have done so, I think you will be ready to acknowledge that, in our eagerness to maintain the Divine Unity, we have not been wholly unmindful of other important doctrines—that in our zeal to disseminate doctrines, we have not quite forgotten duties—and that in our endeavours for the progress of Unitarianism, we have not been indifferent about piety and virtue. We have aimed not only to enlighten the mind, but to warm and purify the heart; not only to deliver men from the bondage of error, but also from the greater bondage of sin. We have had many difficulties to meet—many trials to bear—many obstacles to surmount.

I could not help thinking, my dear brother, that you had wrong views of Unitarian ministers and writers, when you spoke of their "almost perpetual attention to their distinguishing doctrine." I do not attribute this to a want of candour and fairness, but to a want of opportunity to know the true state of the case, as you belong to a different denomination, and are yourself constantly employed in preaching. I have dwelt long on this subject, believing you would be glad to learn that you have been in an error respecting it.

Judging from what has come within my own knowledge, I should rather say that our preachers and writers dwelt on this doctrine too little, than too much. For when I read Moses and the prophets—when I read the instructions of Christ and his Apostles, I cannot persuade myself that this is an unimportant doctrine. When I read the decalogue—when I hear the Saviour repeating the first and great commandment—when I hear him saying, "And this is life eternal, that they might know thee, the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent"—when I listen to Paul standing in the midst of Mars-hill, and addressing the philosophers and people of Athens—when I mark how he begins his sublime discourse—when I read his Epistles, I think I find strong reasons for attaching great importance to the doctrine of the Divine Unity. And when I cast my eye over Catholic countries,—and when I observe how much evil is occasioned by the doctrine of the Trinity nearer home, there seems to me to be a pressing demand for great attention to the true doctrine of the Godhead, and to the errors with which it is still encumbered.

With sentiments of undiminished respect and esteem, I am your friend and brother, JONATHAN FARR.

REV. ADIN BALLOU.

OBITUARY.

We have a mournful task to perform in introducing to these last pages of this periodical our remarks upon an event whose occurrence, we doubt not, has touched the hearts of all our readers with no common sadness.

He who conducted "The Unitarian," and gave to it its life and interest, is no more. The service he has done so well he can do no longer. We believe that he finished the work which God gave him to do on earth, and that a new and nobler work now occupies the energies of his immortal spirit in heaven. We sorrow not as those who have no hope,—for what cause should we have to blush at the weakness of our faith, if, with the departure of every Christian friend, that hope were not increased! What cause should we have to blush for our own slavery to earth, did not the realities of heaven grow brighter to our view whenever a lofty spirit from our very midst makes for itself a clear and glorious pathway to those realities through the clouds of worldly troubles!

Bernard Whitman was born at East Bridgewater, Mass., on the 8th of June, 1796. He was the thirteenth child of Deacon John Whitman. He had no early advantages of education except that of attending a country district school. In his early youth he exhibited that bold and fearless spirit, that open sincerity of opinion and adventurous effort in the accomplishment of what he deemed right, which distinguished him throughout life. His father often expressed the fear that the qualities of this kind which he displayed, would bring him to some untimely end. In 1813, he made up his mind to get an education. He had been very industrious in working upon the farm. He now went to Mansfield, where he laboured in a cotton factory for two years. He was enabled to save about one hundred dollars, and he then applied for admission to the Academy at Exeter, which was granted him. During the two years which he spent at Exeter, he was distinguished for the ardour with which he pursued his studies, and for maintaining the cause of the younger members of the school, against those disposed to tyrannize over them.

He entered college (Harvard University) in 1817. During his first year he rose rapidly as a scholar. At the commencement of his Sophomore year, he was engaged in the rebellion of the students, and was punished with rustication. He spent the time of his absence, except that which was occupied in conducting a winter school, in pursuing the studies of his class, and kept up with them, but, being refused a reädmission to this class, he entered the one next below. He staid only a few weeks so as to take an honourable dismission from the college. He then kept school for a time at Billerica, and was the chief instrument in the establishment of the academy at that place. He commenced his theological studies with an Orthodox minister at Wellfleet, and finished them at Beverly. He then took up his abode in Cambridge as a candidate. He preached in several places. He performed the duties of a minister six months for the small society at Middlesex Village. He received a call from the people at Duxbury, which he did not accept. He was settled at Waltham, Feb. 15, 1826. After his settlement he was very active in promoting the improvement of the girls in the factory. He was the principal instrument in establishing the Rumford Institute in Waltham. He was also actively zealous in the cause of the Sunday-school. As a teacher he secured the confidence and love of his pupils and made powerful impressions upon their hearts.

At Exeter, he was very much excited concerning religious opinions, and very much prejudiced against the Unitarian belief. His predilections for the doctrines of Orthodoxy continued until he commenced the study of the Bible with the determination to base his theological views on the decisions there recorded. By this course his opinions were changed. During the year of his rustication he read Swedenborg's Works, and followed them as he said, as far as he could in consistency with the Bible. When he was settled in the ministry, it was with the determination to keep free from religious controversy. But, being himself attacked, his whole course was changed, and he has acted a distinguished part in the theological polemics of the day.

His services to this community as a public man are so well known that we shall not now consider them in detail. We will

only give a list of the publications which came from his pen during his settlement.

1. An Article in the Christian Examiner on Holiness.
2. A Sermon on Denying the Lord.
3. A Sermon on Regeneration.
4. A Sermon on the Limited Influence of the Gospel.
5. A Sermon on the Means of increasing Public Happiness.
6. A Sermon at the Artillery Election.
7. A Sermon on Christian Salvation.
8. A Sermon on Christian Union.
9. A Lecture on Popular Superstition.
10. Letters on Revivals.
11. An Address at the Dedication of the Masonic Temple, Boston.
12. A volume of "Village Sermons."
13. Letters in the Controversy with Professor Stuart.
14. Letters to Universalists.

To these, had he lived, would have been added a volume of Letters to Unbelievers, some of which have appeared in "The Unitarian." He travelled in the West,—preached a dedication discourse at Cincinnati,—and visited also Louisville (Kentucky), and Richmond (Virginia). He travelled also in Maine, Connecticut, and Rhode Island.—We cannot in brief space speak as we ought of the character of our deceased friend. He seems to us remarkably to have exemplified the power of decided moral purpose. In a notice of him published in the Christian Register since his death, it is said,—"He was remarkable for energy and perseverance,—a conviction of power,—a strong conception of the object of desire, followed by unwearied efforts to attain it,—zeal discouraged by no difficulties, but kindled and excited the more by them to vigorous exertion." Nor did this decided moral purpose of which we speak aim only at the accomplishment of outward objects. It acted most powerfully upon his own soul in transforming every constitutional quality into a Christian grace. We have said that naturally his mental temperament was marked by great boldness and ardour. We need not say how clearly his life has proved that these qualities became thoroughly Christianized in his mind. With a noble prudence he turned all his dispositions and powers to the account of virtue, and, if we may so speak, wrought the *substance* of his mind into the most glorious *forms*.

Mr. Whitman was in the best sense a practical man. He was practical, not in acting without thought, but in proving the energy of his thought by the energy of his life. The importance of the results proved the greatness of his plans. He did not allow his conceptions of the good that might be done to outrun his holy resolutions to effect it. When he had partially recovered from the first violent attack which preceded his gradual decline, we recollect asking him, if he would travel some miles from Waltham to address a body of young men on a subject in which their thoughts were engaged, and in which he was competent to instruct them,—and well do we remember the cheerful and earnest readiness with which he assented to the request,—the fulness of pleasure which shone in his face at the prospect of doing good. We need but a single stroke to delineate the character of the true Christian, and with that stroke the pencil of truth must touch the character of our deceased friend. *He was unwearied in the conception and execution of good resolutions.*

We will conclude this imperfect notice of our deceased brother with a few sentences from a notice which has already appeared. "During his long and lingering sickness all the characteristics of the true Christian shone forth with a brighter and clearer lustre. In this respect he showed an uncommon consistency of character. He manifested no raptures. He never did in health. He was equally free from despondency. He was uniformly calm, and cheerful, and grateful to the last. There was no sign of discontent, no moment of repining. He was accustomed to speak much of the good things with which he was surrounded, and of his unexpected freedom from great distress. His habitual language was that of calm, confiding, and grateful joy. And, as his family and friends gathered round him from time to time, they were astonished to see that the sick and dying man was the happiest of the group. He expressed his entire confidence to the last in the power of that simple faith which he had long cherished and laboured to promote. He thanked God for possessing it, and he prayed for its diffusion. His last words were those which were consecrated by the lips of the Saviour,—'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.'"

MONTHLY LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS,

CONTINUED.

The Martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul; a Poem. By George Burgess, A. M., Minister of Christ's Church, Hartford, Conn.
Vathek, an Oriental Tale. By Mr. Beckford, author of "Italy," &c.
Youth's Keepsake. A Christmas and New Year's Gift for Young People.
Hints for a New Year. By L. F. Dimmick.
The Religion of the Heart, or the Influence of Practical Piety on the Conduct of the Life. By Hannah More.
The Preciousness of Christ to all who believe. By J. Thornton.
A Scriptural View of the Humanity of Jesus Christ. By L. F. Dimmick.
Jenning's Landscape Annual for 183[illegible] ited by T. Roscoe, containing 2[illegible] trations of Granada, from Drawi[illegible] D. Roberts.
Heath's Picturesque Annual, for 183[illegible] 21 Engravings, illustrating Scotland; edited by Leitch Ritchie.
The Gem, for 1835.
Friendship's Offering, for 183[illegible].
Forget Me Not, for 1835.
Oriental Annual, for 1835.

JAMES MUNROE & CO.

HAVE JUST RECEIVED FROM

THE BRITISH AND FOREIGN UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION

THE FOLLOWING INVOICE OF

VALUABLE ENGLISH WORKS.

Unitarianism the Doctrine of the Gospel, by Lant Carpenter, 3d edition.
Farmer's Dissertation on Miracles, 3d edition.
Farmer's Essay on the Demoniacs of the N. Testament, 3d edition.
Priestley's Memoirs, with Observations on his Writings, by T. Cooper and W. Christie; and Four Posthumous Discourses, 3 vols.
Milton's Last Thoughts on the Trinity.
Bible Stories, Part 2d, containing Stories from the N. Testament, by S. Wood.
Price's Four Dissertations, 5th edition.
Belsham's Translation and Exposition of Paul's Epistles, with Notes, 4 vols.
Belsham's Memoirs of Lindsey, 2d edition.
Traité où l'on Expose ce que l'Écriture nous apprend de la Divinité de Jésus Christ, par P. F. Le Courayer.
Ostervald's Discourse on the Authenticity and Divine Origin of the Old Testament, with Notes and Illustrations; translated from the French by J. R. Wreford.
Tagart on the Claims of Unitarian Christianity to the Respectful Consideration of the Reflecting Public.
Barker's Church-Establishment [illegible] Christian, &c.
Harris's Harmony of Nature, Pro[illegible] and Christianity.
Review of Smith's Scripture Testi[illegible] the Messiah.
Orthodoxy and Unbelief, by Ed[illegible] son.
Joyce's Analysis of Paley's View[illegible] Evidences of Christianity, 7th ed[illegible]
The Word made Flesh. A Ser[illegible] fore the British and Foreign U[illegible] Association, by W. Hincks.
Ashworth's Account of the Rise [illegible] gress of the Unitarian Dissenting Societies at Rochdale, 3d edition.
Brief Dissertation on the Ministry [illegible] the Divine Word by Public Pr[illegible] by Rob. Robinson.
Priestley's Unitarianism Explain[illegible] Defended.
Priestley's Outline of the Evide[illegible] Revealed Religion.
Lardner's Letter on the Logos.
Yates on the Unity of God.
Whyte's Sermons on Doctrinal a[illegible] tical Subjects, 2d edition.

BOSTON BOOKSTORE.

JAMES MUNROE & CO., BOOKSELLERS TO THE UNIVERSITY IN CAMBRIDGE, respectfully announce that they have established a branch of their business in the city, and have taken the stand long known as the BOSTON BOOKSTORE, No. 134, WASHINGTON STREET, formerly occupied by CUMMINGS & HILLIARD, and recently by RUSSELL, ODIORNE, & METCALF. By this arrangement it is hoped that the convenience of their customers may be better served, both those in Cambridge, and those residing in the city and at a distance, through the increased facility which will thus be afforded for the execution of their orders.

Boston, November 1, 1834.

JAMES MUNROE AND CO.

HAVE JUST PUBLISHED,

Gisborne's Life of the Saviour, *stereotype edition.*

Lowth's Isaiah, from the tenth English edition, carefully corrected and revised.

Stewart's Philosophy of the Human Mind. 8vo. 2d ed.

Views of Christian Truth, Piety, and Morality, selected from the Writings of Dr. Priestley, with an Introductory Notice of his Life and Character. By Rev. Henry Ware, Jr.

Volume III. of Ware's Sunday Library, being *The Holy Land and its Inhabitants.* By Rev. S. G. Bulfinch, of Augusta, Georgia. Illustrated by a Map of Judea.

IN PRESS.

The Life of the Rev. George Crabbe, author of "Tales of the Hall," &c. &c. By his Son.

A Translation of St. John's Gospel into the German, with an Interlineary Translation into the English; intended to facilitate the acquisition of the German Language. By Charles Follen.

Sunday-School and Parish Libraries will be promptly furnished with the works of the day to order, on the most liberal terms.

Orders for any work published either in this country or in Europe will be attended to without delay.

Liberal terms will be allowed to authors who may favour us with the publication of their works. No pains will be spared to bring out all books in good style and with despatch, and to give them extensive circulation.

Metcalf and Press, Printers, Cambridge.

Stanford University Libraries
3 6105 024 657 475

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
STANFORD AUXILIARY LIBRARY
STANFORD, CALIFORNIA 94305-6004
(650) 723-9201
salcirc@sulmail.stanford.edu
All books are subject to recall.
DATE DUE

MAY 2 7 2002
JUN 7 2002